



**“How the content of online pornography depicts expressed consent for insemination”**

**Carmen M. Cusack, J.D., Nova Southeastern University, USA**

**Abstract**

Insemination is a sex act that requires consent. Legally, expressed consent eliminates any doubt that consent was absent, especially because the absence of objection does not imply consent. The researcher examined how the content of online pornography depicts expressed consent for insemination. The hypothesis accurately predicted that some films would express consent, some would ambiguously discuss ejaculation or consent, and some would remain silent on the subject. This research is important because it offers insight into how pornographic film actors appear to express consent. This research opens the door to future research on the subjects of nonconsensual insemination, expressed consent, and pornographic depictions of these themes.

**Keywords: Nonconsensual Insemination, Pornography, Expressed Consent, Creampie, Cum, Money Shot**



## **Introduction**

This research questions how the content of online pornography depicts expressed consent for insemination? I believe that in many films, consent will be clearly expressed, but in other films it will be absent or ambiguous. Insemination is an additional sex act, which must be consented to separately from coitus (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012; Cusack, 2013b). Consent to be inseminated must be expressed (Cusack, 2012). In order to express consent, parties must be informed as to what they are consenting to (Cusack, 2012). Consent must occur prior to sex acts and should be expressed since the absence of objection does not imply consent (Cusack, 2012). Neither males nor females may be coerced into experiencing nonconsensual insemination (Cusack, 2012; Higdon, 2011; Miller, Jordan, Levenson, & Silverman, 2010; Ryan, 2011). Using the legal standard of expressed consent as the touchstone for consent, I analyzed pornographic films that included depictions of expressed consent (Cusack, 2012). I explained why the films depicted consent (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012). I also analyzed how some films may have suggested consent, but failed to persuade me that it certainly occurred (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012). This research is important for future research and to the public for two reasons (Salmon & Diamond, 2012; Ekstrand, Tydén, Darj & Larsson, 2007). First, pornography is viewed by many people who receive no other sex education than what they learn in pornography (Ekstrand, Tydén, Darj & Larsson, 2007). It is important to learn how these people may understand consensual insemination (Ekstrand, Tydén, Darj & Larsson, 2007). When youth, who have no sexual experience, view pornography it may give them false impressions about sexual behavior, a pathway leading to psycho-social deficits and sex crimes can develop (Alexy, Burgess, & Prentky, 2009; Hunter, Figueredo, & Malamuth, 2010; Mancini, Reckdenwald, & Beauregard, 2012). This understanding can be achieved by building on our study of how consent is expressed in pornographic films (Salmon & Diamond, 2012). Second, documenting how people may request and express consent for insemination in pornography contributes to the greater understanding of sex research in a unique way since these findings could not have been gathered except by peer into the sexual relations of at least 40 couples (Salmon & Diamond, 2012).

## **Literature Review**

Consent is expressed when two people discuss a sexual activity and then agree to engage in it (Taslitz, 2005). Consent may be implied, but implied consent can only exist when two people with a history have a relationship that contains an understanding about which activities can be



consensual (Taslitz, 2005). Aside from this narrow category, i.e. implied consent, an agreement to engage in one sexual act does not imply consent to continue engaging in future or additional sex acts (Cusack, 2011). Though pornographic film actors may have an understanding that they will engage in certain activities, they do not necessarily have an agreement that they will engage in all types of sexual activity (Cusack, 2013a). Actors choose which activities they will engage in and with whom (Cusack, 2013a). Since insemination is an additional sex act, it cannot be implied that pornographic film actors who consent to sex or unprotected sex necessarily consent to insemination (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2013a; Cusack, 2013b). Having acknowledged this, this literature review and research focus primarily on how pornography depicts pornography, not on what actually occurs between actors during the production of the film.

Viewing pornography gives researchers an opportunity to witness sex acts that are often designed to communicate a sexual message (Attwood, 2002). Production of pornography can control the message that pornography communicates (Cusack, 2013b). Documenting the intimate details of private sex, like consent to be inseminated, often requires difficult research or, after a sex crime occurs, careful police evidence (Cusack, 2012). When nonconsensual insemination occurs during private sexual activity, police must rely on text or phone stings, in many cases, to gather any modicum of evidence (Cusack, 2012; *NY v. Jaeger*). Technology, like texts or emails, can prove that an agreement was reached prior to ejaculation, which one party subsequently violated (Cusack, 2012; *N.Y. v. Jaeger*). In pornographic films, the depiction of nonconsensual insemination may not evidence actual nonconsensual insemination, but pornographic films do provide the opportunity to witness pornographers' vision of insemination and the messages that may be viewed by the public (Moore, Weissbein, & Boyle, 2010).

This is an excellent time to research amateur pornography since condom use is being required of professional actors who produce films in Los Angeles, California, which includes San Fernando Valley, the major porn hub in the U.S. (Lin, 2012). The City of Los Angeles Ordinance 181989, known as the Adult Film Industry Act (2012), is a worker safety regulation designed to reduce disease transmission. The Adult Film Industry Act (2012) does not legislate the act of nonconsensual insemination since nonconsensual insemination can occur with or without condom use, and courts have held that condom use cannot prove



consent or nonconsent (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012; Cusack, 2013b; Higdon, 2011). Yet, the use of condoms in professional films may incidentally reduce the number of professional films that attempt to depict insemination (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012; Cusack, 2013b; Higdon, 2011). The effect of this legislation remains the subject of future studies (Adult Film Industry Act, 2012).

For this study, viewing amateur films may be ideal (Efron, 2011). “Porn has always been there but it was fictional....You don’t really know what they’re doing for sure ... there’s a new trend towards amateur everything ... and, at the moment, a sensational appreciation for it” (Efron, 2011). Though the depiction of insemination in amateur films may parody themes or messages previously expressed in mainstream, commercial films, amateur films may also depict authentic sex acts or original messages, which may be freely communicated without condoms (Adult Film Industry Act, 2012). Condom use is significantly higher in amateur films that depict homosexual penetration than heterosexual penetration (Cusack & Waranius, 2012). Since the films researched in this article are heterosexually oriented, the absence of condom use is not unusual (Cusack & Waranius, 2012). Thus, nonuse of condoms in the films reviewed below does not necessarily communicate any particular message other than the likely fact that pornographic films were not professionally produced in Los Angeles after March 5, 2012 (Adult Film Industry Act, 2012).

Irrespective of condom use, many pornographic films do not depict insemination, even though the great majority depict ejaculation (Moore, Weissbein, & Boyle, 2010). Researchers claim that money shots glorify men, which seems to be blatantly sexist (Higdon, 2011; Salmon & Diamond, 2012). The money shot demonstrates the absence of nonconsensual insemination, which is a sex crime (Cusack, 2011). It proves that actors were not coerced into nonconsensual insemination (Cusack, 2011; Campbell, 2007; Taslitz, 2005).

[S]imilar to the meanings of the substance itself, the scripts have changed. No longer the conquering hero, since the 1980s semen...the substance and its definition, is no longer under men's control, if it ever was. It leaks and can be used against men as evidence of malfeasance....[This is why] the cum shot is so prevalent in pornography (Moore, Weissbein, & Boyle, 2010, p. 79).



If consent must be expressed between actors, then what will it sound like (Cusack, 2012; Johnsdotter, 2011)? Moore, Weissbein, and Boyle, identify many terms for ejaculate, including "jizz, cum, breed juice, explosion, facial, ropes, streams, thick hot cum juice, cum shot, creamy cum, medicine load, cum load, cream pie, high-pressure squirter, protein lunch, wad of juice, feeding and cummy" (2010, p. 83). In pornography, actors may use detailed and charged language that arouses the viewer while clearly expressing consent (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012; Johnsdotter, 2011). Or, actors may use lingo or subtle language that seeks and grants consent in the least noticeable manner possible since money shots are more popular than insemination and actors may easily resign themselves to performing money shots without an aggressive attempt to secure consent for insemination (Salmon & Diamond, 2012). In these cases, what would seem like nonconsent to one person could seem like expressed consent to another person (Taslitz, 2005). A clear standard is important, so that viewers know if consent has been sought and granted (Cusack, 2012).

## **Methodology**

This research relied on videos from Youporn.com. Youporn.com is an amateur pornography site that operates like Youtube.com, but for pornography. The public, amateurs, and professionals may upload their pornographic films on Youporn.com. The inclusion criteria for films limited inclusion to those films in which male actors' penises were totally or partially inside the female actors' anuses or vaginas. The criteria did not exclude homosexual or transsexual films. Films were excluded from this study if semen was deposited into or on gaping anuses and vaginas at close range because the penis was not inside the anus or vagina.

Viewers searched Youporn.com for "Cum In Ass". Videos were suggested for viewing by Youporn.com. When titles included the words "creampie" or "cum in ass" then we selected the video. A creampie is defined by Urban Dictionary as "Internal cum shot; Act of ejaculating inside pussy or asshole. Also the moment after the internal ejaculation, when the cum drips out." Urban Dictionary also says

Creampie, or internal cum shot, is a colloquial term in pornography to describe when a man ejaculates inside his partner's vagina. In pornography vaginal sex is generally followed by a facial or other visible ejaculation. This, coupled with the fact that the wearing of condoms for vaginal and anal intercourse is now commonplace in pornography -- whereas a creampie by its very nature cannot be accomplished while



wearing a condom -- makes ejaculating in the vagina a novel situation which can be advertised to attract viewers (Urbandictionary.com, 2012a).

Viewers only selected videos that were less than 6 minutes in length and contained the “cum in” or “creampie in” in the title. No preference was given to the appearance of the actors or the supposed storyline suggested by the title. However, as a precaution against accidentally viewing child pornography, any videos that contained the words “young” or “teen” in the titles were excluded. Foreign language films were excluded if they were not dubbed. Youporn.com never suggested films in which homosexual/bisexual men or transsexuals were inseminated anally and were less than 6 minutes. Youporn.com only suggested films in which women were inseminated anally and vaginally and were less than 6 minutes.

When a video’s title and length met the criteria, viewers selected it and screened it. To screen the films, viewers forwarded to the last third of the film and watched for male ejaculation scenes. If the films contained insemination, then we watched the films from the beginning. If the films did not contain insemination, then we did not watch the films. Some films were orgy films. In these films, viewers did not presume that the ejaculation would only occur in the last third of the film. They did not screen orgy films, and watched these films in their entirety. If the film depicted an actor withdrawing prior to ejaculation, then the film was not viewed. When films did not depict internal ejaculation, viewers hit the “back” button and continued to scan the suggested videos in the original order that they were suggested by Youporn.com. Viewers repeated this process until they viewed ten films that depicted internal, anal ejaculation for each search. Viewers searched for and watched “Cum In Pussy”, “Anal Creampie”, and “Pussy Creampie” videos using the same process. Viewers repeated the methodology until ten videos were viewed for each search term.

Viewers recorded the name of the film. As we watched the films from the beginning, we noted any relevant dialogue as well as a description of when the conversation occurred: before sex, during sex before ejaculation, during ejaculation, after sex. Relevant dialogue was any dialogue about ejaculation or any ambiguous dialogue that could have been about ejaculation that occurred during sex. Any dialogue that did not possibly refer to ejaculation was excluded. “NC” (no comment) was recorded when there was no commentary whatsoever that could possibly have been about ejaculation.



Viewers transcribed all dialogue about ejaculate and insemination that appeared to occur prior to, during, or after ejaculation. Viewers watched the videos together comparing notes on dialogue during and after transcribing the dialogue. Viewers always agreed on which conversations should be transcribed and which films should be labeled “NC”. There was an inter-rater agreement K value of 1.

The videos comprised three groups: Certain Consent, Possible Consent, and Nonconsent. Videos that were encoded as “NC” were automatically grouped as Nonconsensual because of the absence of expressed consent (Cusack, 2012). Viewers rewound the films as many times as we needed to in order to record all of the dialogue. Once the dialogue was recorded, we discussed the videos. Using a standard of expressed consent in which consent occurs before ejaculation, viewers classified the films. Films that are included in the Certain Consent category are those that viewers believed communicated consent without a doubt. Films were categorized as Possible Consent when the language used might possibly express consent to some viewers, but not to us (Taslitz, 2005).

The data is reported in sections, Cum In Ass, Cum In Pussy, Anal Creampie, and Pussy Creampie. Each section contains the films that were retrieved using that search term. The films are listed 1-10 in the order that they were viewed. Actors’ conversations are transcribed below the film’s number. The inclusion of transcription data does not indicate that the researcher believed that consent had successfully been expressed by any legal standard. But, it does indicate that viewers were under the impression that there was not necessarily an absence of consent. In the Analysis, the films are discussed according to their categories, which are Certain Consent and Possible Consent. Since no dialogue occurred in some films, i.e., NC/Nonconsent, no analysis is provided for these films.

## **Data**

### Cum In Ass

#### 1. Certain Consent

Female: "Because I love you so much, I'm going to going to let you cum inside my ass. Is that OK?"

Male: "Oh, yeah."



2. Nonconsent
3. Certain Consent  
Male: “I want to pump you right up in the ass. Keep that rhythm going.”  
Female: “Yeah, yeah, yeah, Oh fuck yeah.”
4. Nonconsent
5. Nonconsent
6. Possible Consent  
Female: “Oh yeah cum”
7. Nonconsent
8. Certain Consent  
Male: “Want that cum?” “You want it?”  
Female: “Yeah”  
Male: “Spread that ass for me.”
9. Nonconsent
10. Possible Consent  
Female: “Check it out on [drippingcreampies.com](http://drippingcreampies.com)”

### Cum In Pussy

1. Certain Consent  
Female: “Cum for me.”  
Male: “Cum’s for you?”  
Female: “Yeah”  
Male: “Yeah...OK...You feeled it?”  
Female: “Oh yeah”
2. Nonconsent
3. Certain Consent  
Male: “I’m gonna cum.”  
Female: “Fill me up, Daddy”  
Male: “OK...Can you feel it?”
4. Nonconsent
5. Nonconsent
6. Nonconsent
7. Certain Consent





Male: “OK, I’m gonna cum inside your pussy, Baby.”

Female: “Oh, cum! Cum! Yeah?”

Male: “Yeah, tell the camera I’m gonna cum inside your pussy.”

Female: “Cum inside my pussy.”

Male: “Yeah!?”

Female: “Cum inside my fucking pussy.”

8. Nonconsent

9. Certain Consent

Male: “Can I fill you up?”

Female: “Oh, yes...Oh! Yeah!...Yes”

Male: “Cum?”

Female: “Oh, yes. Yes.”

Male: “Can I cum?”

Female: “Oh yes”

10. Possible Consent

Male: “I’m gonna cum soon”

Female: “Yeah...It feels good”

Male: “Yeah?”

Female: “Yeah”

Male: “Oh my god

Female: Yeah

Male: I’m gonna cum”

Female: “Yeah”

Anal Creampie

1. Nonconsent

2. Nonconsent

3. Nonconsent

4. Nonconsent

5. Nonconsent

6. Certain Consent

Male: “Fill you up?...Fuck your asshole?”

Female: “Oh, fill me!”



7. Nonconsent

8. Possible Consent

Male: “Ready?”

Female: “Yeah”

9. Possible Consent

Male #1: Cumming

Female: “Are you cumming?”

Male #1: “Cumming”

Female: “Oh yeah, load me up...Cum in that pussy...Load me up.”

Male #2: “Oh, here I cum”

Female: “Load me up. Load me up. Load me up.”

10. Certain Consent

Male: “I want to come in your ass.”

Female: “Oh, yeah, cum”

### Pussy Creampie

1. Possible Consent

Female: “Baby are you gonna cum inside of me? Huh? Baby, Yeah?”

Male: “I’m still cumming.”

Female: “OK”

Female: “Good job, baby...That felt good.”

Male: “Yes it did...”

Female: “We have to do that more often.”

Male: “Uhhhh, you might want to get on birth control first.”

Female: “That’d probably be a wise idea.”

2. Nonconsent

3. Certain Consent

Female: “Cum in my pussy, cum in my pussy”

Male #1: “Fuck yeah, I’m cumin. Fuck yeah, I’m cumin.”

Female: “Cum in my pussy, Baby. Cum in my pussy.Cum in my pussy. I want that double load.”

4. Nonconsent

5. Nonconsent



6. Possible Consent

Female #1: “Cum Inside her”

Male: “Yeah?”

Female #1: “Yeah cum inside her”

Female # 2: “Yeah, oh yeah, uh huh”

Female #1: “Have you let a guy cum inside you before?”

Female #2: “Nuh, uh”

7. Possible Consent

Female: “Put it in my fucking pussy”

8. Nonconsent

[Threesome]

9. Nonconsent

10. Nonconsent

## Discussion

To present findings about how the content of online pornography depicts or fails to depict expressed consent for insemination, films were grouped into three categories, Certain Consent, Possible Consent, and Nonconsent. To qualify as Certain Consent, the actors had to discuss insemination prior to the depiction of ejaculation, not solely during or after. Because ejaculation was internal, there can be no certainty that ejaculation occurred after the actors expressed consent. This is not a limitation because our study questions how consent is depicted, not whether it actually occurred. Films were grouped as Possible Consent for two reasons. Either, they gave the impression that actors had arranged the scene beforehand, but failed to depict expressed consent before ejaculation on film, or they ambiguously communicated consent in the researcher’s opinion. Films grouped as Nonconsent contained no comments that could possibly relate to ejaculation, and are not analyzed.

The following analysis is exploratory. It offers ideas of what the viewers perceived and what other viewers may perceive. At its most precise, it specifies whether insemination was certainly consented to or not using a legal the legal standard as the threshold. But, at its most creative, the analysis questions what producers/actors/directors may have been attempting to depict for the audience. The both aspects of the analysis help to explain how consent is depicted.



### **Certain Consent**

In Cum In Ass film #1, before sex, the female says "Because I love you so so much, I'm going to let you cum inside my ass. Is that OK?" The male replies, "Oh, yeah." Here consent is expressed before sex. There is no doubt that the female is expressing informed consent voluntarily. This is a very certain expression of consent. In Cum In Ass film #3, the male says "I want to pump you right up in the ass. Keep that rhythm going." The female says, "Yeah, yeah, yeah, Oh fuck yeah." This dialogue does not express consent as a question/answer dialogue. The man expresses a desire for her to keep the rhythm going in order to bring him to orgasm. He commands her to fulfill his desires, and she assents. This was a common kind of expressed consent in these films. Several actors expressed a desire that was supported by their partners or commanded their partners to perform. This film is dubbed with this dialogue, which repeats twice during the film. Like the other dubbed films, this film left us wondering why this dialogue was specifically included by the editors. Does this dialogue glorify male orgasm or consent (Salmon & Diamond, 2012)? Does this dialogue exonerate partners from the culpability of nonconsensuality? In Cum In Ass film #8, the male does not ask if he may inseminate his partner or if she wants him to. He literally asks if she wants the ejaculate. He says, "Want that cum?" "You want it?" The female replies "Yeah". The male says "Spread that ass for me." The male's retort does not enhance or detract from the consent. Had he only said, "spread that ass for me," and she did, then the consent would have been insufficient (Cusack, 2012). He would not have expressly informed her of his intent to inseminate her, and she would not have been able to express informed consent (Cusack, 2011). But his inquiry about her desire for his ejaculate and her assent signified informed and expressed consent to the viewers.

In Cum in Pussy film # 3, the male states, "I'm gonna cum." The female says "Fill me up, Daddy". According to Urban Dictionary, a "fill up" occurs "[w]hen a man injects semen into his woman's vagina" (Urbandictionary.com, 2012b). He assents as if she made a request. He says, "OK", and then asks "Can you feel it?" The dialogue implies that insemination occurs after the conversation. His response, "OK" implies that he will perform what she has requested. This film was also dubbed. In Cum In Pussy #7, a dubbed film, the male states, "OK, I'm gonna cum inside your pussy, Baby." This statement alone would not express consent. But the subsequent dialogue certainly expresses consent. The female says, "Oh, cum! Cum! Yeah?" The male replies, "Yeah, tell the camera I'm gonna cum inside your pussy." This



obviously depicts that the conversation is occurring prior to ejaculation. The female states “Cum inside my pussy.” The male then asks for her consent. He says “Yeah!?” She repeats her sentiment, “Cum inside my fucking pussy.” This statement provides viewers with the certainty that she has expressed her consent before insemination. In Cum In Pussy film #9, the male asks, “Can I fill you up?” He is asking if he can fill her with semen. The female says, “Oh, yes...Oh! Yeah!...Yes”. He asks again, “Cum?” She reiterates her consent, “Oh, yes. Yes.” The male then asks for her permission to ejaculate. The male says, “Can I cum?” The female replies, “Oh yes”. Consent is clearly expressed (Cusack, 2012).

In Anal Creampie #6, during anal sex, the male asks, “Fill you up?...Fuck your asshole?” The female’s reply echoes his question. The female says, “Oh, fill me!” The consensuality is certain. The male asks if he may inseminate her prior to his ejaculation. The female consents. The dialogue in Anal Creampie #10 is also quite succinct. The male states his desire, saying, “I want to come in your ass.” The female replies to his statement as if it were a question. She encourages him to inseminate her. The female says, “Oh, yeah, cum.”

In Pussy Creampie #3, a Female is having vaginal sex with two males simultaneously. She commands the first male, saying “Cum in my pussy, cum in my pussy.” He assents by saying, “Fuck yeah, I’m cumin. Fuck yeah, I’m cumin.” The first male has clearly consented. Unfortunately, the second male’s consent is not as clear. He is lying beneath the two other partners, who are lying on top of him. The female says to the second male, who is on the bottom, “Cum in my pussy, Baby. Cum in my pussy. Cum in my pussy. I want that double load.” Here she is not solely commanding him; she is also informing him of her desires, which is slightly less aggressive language. The second male just witnessed the first male inseminating the female, and she expresses her desire clearly. Yet, the second male does not verbally consent. This video is categorized as Certain Consent because of the dialogue between the first male and the female, but it could also be categorized as Possible Consent because of the dialogue between the female and the second male.

#### Possible Consent

In Cum In Ass #6, the female says “Oh yeah cum.” This statement was made in the instant just before or after the male started ejaculating. The male never asked for the female’s consent. Her lone statement suggests that she was aware of the imminence of insemination or



the act of insemination. Because he made no request to inseminate her and the question of timing remains unanswerable, then consent is appears doubtful (Cusack, 2011). However, the film still makes it seem possible that the insemination was consensual since the female encourages the male. There is no relevant dialogue in Cum In Ass # 10. However, when the film concludes, the female actor faces the camera and says, “Check it out on drippingcreampies.com” This is stated after sex has concluded. This video is categorized as Possible Consent because it gives the impression that the actors created this creampie video for drippingcreampies.com. The female may have consented to insemination prior to shooting the film. However, the other possibility is that the male actor nonconsensually inseminated her, but she decided to capitalize on the moment (Campbell, 2007). Perhaps she had not planned to upload the video to this particular website, but once the creampie occurred, she quickly reasoned that the film could be marketed at this website. There are a number of possible explanations for this advertisement. Since one of them includes consensual insemination, this video was categorized as Possible Consent.

In Cum In Pussy film #1, the female says “Cum for me.” Independent of the other statements, this statement cannot be understood to equate to “cum inside me”. Yet, the male’s response and the subsequent dialogue possibly express consent. The male says, “Cum’s for you?” The female replies, “Yeah”. The male replies to her by saying, “Yeah, OK.” The male begins to ejaculate and asks, “You feeled it?” During his ejaculation, she replies to his question, by saying “Oh yeah”. The dialogue is ambiguous. This conversation begins with a command that could indicate that the female would like for the male to withdraw. Without more, the meaning of statement cannot be objectively defined, but to him, it means that he is eliciting and providing expressed consent.

In Cum In Pussy #10, the male reports to the female, “I’m gonna cum soon.” She replies, “Yeah...It feels good.” These statements are ambiguous. It is unknown whether she means that his ejaculate would feel good or if the sex feels good. If she means that the sex feels good, then is she saying that she understands why the sex would cause him to ejaculate, or if she asking him to delay ejaculation because the sex feels good? The male asks her, “Yeah?” She replies, “Yeah”. Then he states, “Oh my god.” The female says, “Yeah.” This question asking and answering may refer to ejaculation or it may refer to sex. The male finally states, “I’m gonna cum,” and the female replies, “Yeah.” The question and answer clearly came before



the ejaculation, but the meaning is unknown. The ambiguity gives the impression that the female is accepting his behavior, but she may not be informed that he will inseminate her (Campbell, 2007; Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012). Then again, this conversation may have clearly served to subtly communicate his request to inseminate her and her consent to be inseminated.

In Anal Creampie #8, the male asks, “Ready?” and the female answers, “Yeah” prior to ejaculation. It is certainly possible that they shared an understanding of the meaning of these words, this is not certain (Taslitz, 2005). It is possible that the male is asking the female if she is ready for him to withdraw, or it is just as possible that the female believes that the male is asking her if she is ready to be inseminated. This dialogue is not clear. In Anal Creampie #9, the two males are vaginally penetrating a female simultaneously. The first male states, “Cumming”. The female asks, “Are you cumming?” The first male repeats his announcement, “Cumming”. Then the female says, “Oh yeah, load me up...Cum in that pussy...Load me up.” The viewers do not know whether the comments are made in advance of the release or during the release of semen. Either scenario is possible. The woman obviously approves of the ejaculation, irrespective of the timing. The second male then states, “Oh, here I cum.” The female states, “Load me up. Load me up. Load me up.” The second male’s statement is more imminent. He seems to be describing what is inevitably about to happen. She has expressed her consent to be inseminated, but perhaps her consent only extended to the first partner. If it extended to both, perhaps it only sufficed to actually give consent to the second partner prior to the initiation of ejaculation.

In Pussy Creampie #1 it is uncertain if coercion occurred or if the requests for consent from each party were subtle. In this dubbed film, the female asks, “Baby are you gonna cum inside of me? Huh? Baby, Yeah?” She presses the male verbally while seated on top of him. He inseminates her, but never expresses consent. When the female attempts to dismount him, the male says, “I’m still cumming.” She assents by saying, “OK” and remaining seated. The conversation seems to reflect their understanding that he wanted to inseminate her. She says, “Good job, baby...That felt good.” The reason that she praises him is unknown. Did he follow an order? Did he execute a plan properly? The male replies, “Yes it did [feel good].” The female says “We have to do that more often.” This insinuates that their relationship does not include an understanding that he should inseminate her. If it does not include an



understanding, then implied consent cannot be a defense to his absence of consent (Taslitz, 2005). The male replies “Uhhhhm, you might want to get on birth control first.” This reply left us wondering whether the male had consented at all, and whether the female had committed reproductive coercion. But, I also wonder why if she was concerned about unintended pregnancy, he would ask the female to remain seated while he finished ejaculating? His insistence that he continue inseminating her negates our suspicions that the act was coercive even though the language insinuates his reluctance and he never expressed consent. In reply to his comment about birth control use, the female retorts, “That’d probably be a wise idea.” In *Pussy Creampie #6* a female (Female #2) and a male are having sex. Female #2 is seated on another female (Female #1) who is nude. Female #1 is stimulating Female #2, but Female #1 is not touching the male. Female #1 and the male are not having any sexual relations. Female #1 says to the male “Cum Inside her.” Female #1 wants the male to inseminate Female #2. He seeks consent, saying “Yeah?” It is not clear if he is asking the Female #1 or #2 for consent. Female #1 reasserts her request. Female #1 says, “Yeah cum inside her.” Then Female #2 says “Yeah, oh yeah, uh huh.” Then, it seems as if the male ejaculates. Female #1 asks Female #2, “Have you let a guy cum inside you before?” Female #2 replies, “Nuh, uh”. From this dialogue, many questions arise. Did female #2 consent prior to insemination? It seems as if she did. If female #2 had never let a male inseminate her, then was she on birth control? Was the male informed about the possibility that she was not? Did female #1 attempt to inflict reproductive coercion on female #2 or the male? Was female #1 reminding female #2 of their prior agreement to include insemination or was female #1 making a suggestion, not a command. To whom did the male reply? It seems that consent was sought and granted, but the dialogue allows for the inference of other possibilities. In *Pussy Creampie #7*, the female demands, “Put it in my fucking pussy.” It is unknown if this comment occurs simultaneously with or prior to insemination, but it occurs in close proximity to the event. It is unknown if the man consented, was coerced, or nonconsensually inseminated the woman. However, expressed consent was possible since she expressly stated that he should ejaculate inside of her.

I observed some general themes in language choice throughout these films. In these films, actors did not explicitly gloat that consent was not expressed or that a partner’s sexual agency was violated (Cusack, 2013; Dworkin, 1999). For example, there was no dialogue in which one actor stated “I don’t want you to cum inside me,” and another actor replied, “You





don't have a choice. I am going to force you to take this cum into your pussy” or ““You don't have a choice. I am going to force you to cum into my pussy.” Because of how much pornography exists on the internet, it is entirely possible that a subgenre of film exists in which this language is fetishistically or incidentally included (Moore, Weissbein, & Boyle, 2010; O'Donohue, 2008). There was an overlap in the language used in the Certain Consent and Possible Consent categories. The phrase “fill up”, in various forms, was very popular. Based on its appearance in Urban Dictionary (Urbandictionary.com, 2012) and its repeated use in these cum/creampie films, “fill up” seems to be an industry recognized phrase. Because of the phrase's contextual use in these films, and the commonness of the phrase on the web, it seems that the public understands this phrase (Urbandictionary.com, 2012; Youporn.com, 2012). This is positive since the inclusion of this phrase is an organic way to include messages of consent in English language or dubbed films (Urbandictionary.com). It is unknown whether youth understand this phrase or whether some fetishists regard this phrase--or any other language that indicates consent--as being relevant to actual sex acts and consent between partners (Laws & O'Donohue, 2008). These groups would require further study since they may have a greater tendency to move through pathways that lead to sex crimes via pornography (Alexy, Burgess, & Prentky, 2009; Aslan, 2011; Laws & O'Donohue, 2008).

There seemed to be more occasions during which a male was depicted as asking for consent to inseminate. This may indicate that films reflect male reluctance to cause unwanted pregnancy (Ekstrand, M., Tydén, Darj, & Larsson, 2007; Higdon, 2011). When pregnancy was discussed, it seemed like Possible Consent, and the male was reluctant to unintentionally impregnate his partner. It could also indicate that producers/actors/directors are aware that men ought to seek consent but that they are not aware that females ought to seek consent to be inseminated, too (Higdon, 2011). However, other explanations exist for why males were depicted as initiating conversations about consent (Campbell, 2007). Women and men exhibited a great deal of agency, and women and men exhibited a great deal of reckless behavior (Cusack, 2012). Though not directly related, love was discussed in one film in which the female is depicted as granting consent to be inseminated prior to the initiation of sex. Further research could be conducted about the relationship between the depiction of love, consent, and female agency in pornographic films, and the possible effect on viewers (M & Joshua, 2012).

## Conclusion

As predicted, in many films, consent was clearly expressed. Unfortunately, in several of the films, consent was not expressed or was ambiguous. This problem raises questions about the consensuality of the acts that were depicted. When films exclude dialogue that expresses consent, it could leave the impression that expressed consent or any consent is unnecessary. When nonconsensual insemination occurs, it is a sex crime that can accompany the transmission of disease and unwanted pregnancy (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012). Pornographic film industry practices could require actors to depict expressed consent in each film.

Though the depiction of nonconsensual insemination could result from editorial and artistic decisions, some scholars have argued that pornography that depicts sex crimes serves as the memorialization of sex crimes that actually occurred (Dworkin, 1999). In films where actual sex crimes occurred, then police have more evidence of the act than they would if the sex act occurred in private. Pornography, really, should not be blamed for this silver lining (Cusack, 2012). When films depict sex crimes that did not actually occur, then viewers may be influenced, nevertheless (Law & O'Donohue, 2008). Policies that require film producers to notify viewers that no sex crimes have occurred may open a pathway for actors, who have low sexual agency, to discuss nonconsensual insemination with their partners, and may steer vulnerable viewers away from mimicry of depicted sex crimes (Alexy, Burgess, & Prentky, 2009; Campbell, 2007; Laws & O'Donohue, 2008).

Nonconsensual insemination has conscripted too many men and women into parenthood and been the cause of disease transmission for far too long (Adult Film Industry Act, 2012; Cusack, 2013; Higdon, 2011). The pornography industry may influence the way that some people perceive the necessity of consent, which might increase sexual violations, unwanted pregnancies, and disease transmission (Cusack, 2011; Cusack, 2012; Cusack, 2013). Whether viewers who can be influenced represent a significant portion of the population is a matter for further research, which could determine whether a speech restriction on pornography, such as a viewer notification, could be justified (Cusack, 2013b). Speech restrictions may not be necessary if pornography producers, who would like to differentiate their films from rape films or the types of films that correlate with sex crimes, voluntarily add messages or dialogue that depicts consent (Alexy, Burgess, & Prentky, 2009; Laws & O'Donohue, 2008).



## References

- Adult Film Industry Act (2012). Los Angeles, CA., Ordinance 181989.
- Alexy, E. M., Burgess, A. W., & Prentky, R. A. (2009). Pornography use as a risk marker for an aggressive pattern of behavior among sexually reactive children and adolescents. *Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association*, 14(6), 442–453.
- Aslan, D. (2011). Critically evaluating typologies of internet sex offenders: A psychological perspective. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 11(5), 406.
- Attwood, F. (2002). Reading porn: The paradigm shift in pornography research. *Sexualities*, 5, 1, p. 91-105. doi: 10.1177/1363460702005001005
- Campbell, C. L. (2007). Investigating women's coping responses to unwanted sexual advances: The predictive utility of agency and situational goals. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, Retrieved from <http://ezproxylocal.library.nova.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/622023269?accountid=6579>
- Cusack, C.M. (2011). Consensual insemination, an analysis of social deviance within gender, family, or the home (Etudes 6). *Journal of Law & Social Deviance* 2, 158.
- Cusack, C.M. (2012). Nonconsensual Insemination: Battery. *Journal of Law & Social Deviance* 3, 78.
- Cusack, C.M. (forthcoming, 2013a). Obscene squirting: If the government thinks it's urine, then they've got another thing coming. *Texas Journal of Women & Law*.
- Cusack, C.M. (forthcoming, 2013b). Nonconsensual seminal transmission. *Criminal Law Bulletin*.
- Cusack, C.M. & Waranius, M. (2012, forthcoming). Nonconsensual insemination and pornography: The relationship between sex roles, sex crimes, and “STRT,” “Gay,” and “Shemale” films on Youporn.com. *Journal of Research in Gender Studies*.
- Ekstrand, M., Tydén, T., Darj, E., & Larsson, M. (2007). Preventing pregnancy: A girls' issue. seventeen-year-old swedish boys' perceptions on abortion, reproduction and use of contraception. *The European Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care*, 12(2), 111-118. doi: 10.1080/13625180701201145
- Effron, L. (2011, October, 14). ABC News. The Appeal of Amateur Porn. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/health/2011/10/14/the-appeal-of-amateur-porn/>
- Higdon, Michael J. (2011). Fatherhood by conscription: Nonconsensual insemination and the duty of child support. *Georgia Law Review* 46, 407.



- Hunter, J. A., Figueredo, A. J., & Malamuth, N. M. (2010). Developmental pathways into social and sexual deviance. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(2), 141-148. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9277-9>
- Johnsdotter, S. (2011). The flow of her cum: On a recent semantic shift in an erotic word. *Sexuality & Culture*, 15. 2, 179-194.
- Laws, D.R. & O'Donohue, W.T. (2008). *Sexual Deviance*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Lin II, R. (2012, July 4). LA Times. L.A. County voters to decide on requiring condoms in porn. Retrieved from <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/07/la-county-voters-could-decide-on-requiring-condoms-in-porn.html>
- M, D. C., & Joshua, N. H. (2012). Women, female sex and love addicts, and use of the internet. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 19(1-2), 53.
- Mancini, C., Reckdenwald, A., & Beauregard, E. (2012). Pornographic exposure over the life course and the severity of sexual offenses: Imitation and cathartic effects. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(1), 21.
- Miller, E., Jordan, B., Levenson, R., & Silverman, J.G. (2010). Reproductive coercion: connecting the dots between partner violence and unintended pregnancy. *Contraception Journal*. 83, 274. Retrieved from <http://www.arhp.org/publications-and-resources/contraception-journal/june-2010>
- Moore, L. J., Weissbein, J., & Boyle, K. (2010). *Cocktail parties: Fetishizing semen in pornography beyond bukkake*. (pp. 77-89). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, New York, NY.
- NY v. Jaeger*, No. 1042011, (N.Y. App. Div. 2012).
- Ryan, K.M. (2011). The relationship between rape myths and sexual scripts: The social construction of rape. *Sex Roles* 65. 11-12, 774-782.
- Salmon, C. & Diamond, A. (2012). Evolutionary perspectives on the content analysis of heterosexual and homosexual pornography. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology* 6(2), 193-202.
- Taslitz, A.E. (2005). Willfully blinded: On date rape and self-deception. *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender* 28, 381.
- Urban Dictionary. (2012). "Creampie". Retrieved from <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=creampie>
- Urban Dictionary. (2012). "Fill up". Retrieved from <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=fill+up>