



# **Sex Dolls, Sex Robots, and the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Undress and Abuse Children**

**CultureReframed**

## **Table of Contents**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Overview</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Realistic Child Porn: AI, Deepfakes, Undressing Apps</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>AI Childporn and the Law</b>                             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Sex Dolls</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>AI Sex Dolls and Robots</b>                              | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Anguish Coupled to Misogyny</b>                          | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Violence and Rape</b>                                    | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Child Sex Dolls and Robots</b>                           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Will Sex Dolls and Sex Robots Curb Abuse?</b>            | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Sex Dolls and the Law</b>                                | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Teledildonics</b>  | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   | <b>28</b> |
| <b>References</b>   | <b>29</b> |

## Overview

A previous report for Culture Reframed, [Artificial Intelligence, Virtual Reality, and Pornography: How Misogyny Constrains the Future](#), discussed the growing role of Artificial Intelligence or AI for the pornography industry. These advanced computer programs, or algorithms, are making it easy and quick for any consumer of pornography to create their own images, including fake and modified images that realistically portray children. The industry now draws significant profits from peddling not only adult misogyny and violence, but also child sexual abuse. That report, however, focused on how computer-generated pornography – deepfakes, virtual girlfriends, AI porn, undressing apps, virtual reality, and more – impacted adults. This report turns to the use of AI to harm children (people under the age of 18). The report, too, includes technologies not covered in the earlier investigation, such as sex dolls and sex robots, which allow adult men to mimic the actual rape of a child.

Nothing discussed here, as the earlier report stressed, is buried in the Dark Web. Every website, platform, doll, robot, and computer program mentioned herein is readily available on the surface web – as simple to find as CNN or the BBC. Behind every one of these applications is a company that wants to be found in order to profit from abuse - and often doing so through the very same credit cards and payment platforms you use in your everyday life. Sex dolls and sex robots in particular are often seen by many academics, as we will see, as pointing the way to a future freed from the harmful constraints of heteronormativity. It is not true. These claims ignore the fact that the vast majority of AI sexual programs, devices, and images do little more than reproduce conventional pornographic fantasies. They are intended to make the violence of pornography seem all the more normal, convincing, and pleasurable.

A common ploy of the pornography industry and their academic apologists is to dismiss any criticism as a veiled defense of ‘traditional’ sexuality, gender, marriage, and monogamy and the dread of technology. That claim, in so far as this paper is concerned, is patently false. Proponents of AI sex devices (e.g., Danaher 2019a), too, like advocates of pornography, also like to co-opt the term “sex positive.” That, too, is false. AI pornography is only positive about violence, misogyny, and child abuse. These claims are tantamount to gaslighting. This paper exposes the truth.

## Realistic Child Porn: AI, Deepfakes, Undressing Apps

AI algorithms, trained on large datasets of genuine images, can generate fake but realistic and also cartoonish photos and videos. In the hands of malicious actors, these types of programs can generate content that, as discussed in the previous CR report (see above), seemingly depicts identifiable people in pornographic activities that *never* occurred. These realistic images are convincing lies, indistinguishable from frauds. That the people defamed rarely, if ever, granted consent for the fraudulent images is a central motivation for creating them.

A particularly common form of AI pornography is the ‘nudifying’ app or website. The user uploads a photograph of someone clothed, typically a woman or girl, and the program returns

the image ‘undressed.’ The person appears realistically naked. These types of applications are increasingly popular among schoolboys to humiliate their female peers<sup>1</sup> - at an age when girls already suffer the debilitating effects of pervasive exposure to sexualized media, which results in their own hyper-self-sexualization.<sup>2</sup>

These apps are akin to forcing an adolescent girl to parade naked against her will down the school hallway. It is so common and, to some boys, so blasé, that one middle school boy called the images he created – in one case, from a social media photo of a girl at a mall – “Pokémon cards.”<sup>3</sup> In another instance, the nudifying app was found on TikTok, and some of the fake naked images posted to Snapchat.<sup>4</sup> The psychological effects can prove devastating. Various news reports tell of girls crying in the hallways, feeling violated, used, unsafe, scared, and violently ill. Some girls have been so traumatized that they take their own lives.<sup>5</sup>

AI can also create lifelike pornographic images of nonexistent people. These may seem like ‘victimless crimes.’ But since the fake people so portrayed are almost always female, these images contribute to the wider objectification of women and girls. The victims, too, include boys and men whose sexuality is increasingly shaped by a pornography industry fueled by misogyny and violence.

With just a few keystrokes, as also shown in the previous White Paper, any adult or adolescent can easily find innumerable commercial and free websites that harness AI for these pornographic purposes. One can also download for free algorithms that make these types of images from public repositories of computer code, such as Microsoft-owned GitHub. You can then run the program yourself. Little expertise or equipment is required beyond a high school computer course and a gaming computer.

These programs and websites are legal, even as they are increasingly used to churn out images that are indistinguishable from real child pornography. Many were trained on images that included actual child abuse, such as Stable Diffusion, a hugely popular open-source platform available for anybody to download and use for free (Theil, 2023)<sup>6</sup>. Stable Diffusion is mainly used for legitimate purposes. But it can also generate fake child porn.

As an aside, I use the term “child pornography” rather than, as many do, “child sexual abuse material” or CSAM. The latter is intended to differentiate legal pornography from child

---

<sup>1</sup>Recent news coverage includes “[Schools face a new threat: 'Nudify' sites that use AI to create realistic, revealing images of classmates](#),” CBS News, 15 December 2024; “[Beverly Hills middle school expels 5 students after deepfake nude photos incident](#),” NBC News, 8 March 2024; “[Teen girls confront an epidemic of deepfake nudes in schools](#),” New York Times, 8 April 2024.

<sup>2</sup>See the Culture Reframed 2019 Report, “[The sexualization of girls: An update](#).”

<sup>3</sup>“[Everett middle schooler says classmate made and traded AI porn of her](#),” Fox 13 Seattle, 20 December 2024

<sup>4</sup>“[What was she supposed to report?: Police report shows how a high school deepfake nightmare unfolded](#),” 404 Media, 15 February 2024.

<sup>5</sup>Recently, the media reported AI apps that create realistic but fake and nonconsensual videos of people kissing by morphing two photographs (e.g., “[Gross AI apps create videos of people kissing without their consent](#),” Futurism, 8 January 2025). No consent is required. These may seem innocuous, but they could easily be seen as a type of grooming for the creation of more explicit undressing and AI-generated sexuality images.

<sup>6</sup>See also the December 2023 blog post, “[Investigation finds AI image generation models trained on child abuse](#),” by the Cyber Policy Center, Stanford University.



abuse. That distinction, as this report shows, is tendentious. The industry as a whole is inherently abusive and coercive to children. The term “child pornography” makes that clear.

Do commercial and free online platforms that generate ‘adult’ AI porn also allow for the creation of images that depict what to the average person would appear to be a preadolescent girl beyond any reasonable doubt? I do not know. I did not try to create these types of images and would never do so. The terms and conditions of these websites generally caution users against trying to generate images of children or threaten to report them to authorities. These warnings, however, seem dubious.

In fact, most of these websites allow users to create images of females who arguably look like minor teens and sometimes prepubescent girls. The platforms present the user with a slate of options so he<sup>7</sup> can tailor-make the image after their exact pornographic fantasies. One of many free platforms, called [Dessi](#)<sup>8</sup>, requires no registration or proof of age. It allows users to select, say, “18 years old,” and then to add other features characteristic of younger girls, including pigtails, pajamas, cheerleader outfit, and a school setting. Dessi also permits users to select physical attributes such as “petite,” “small tits,” “tight pussy,” and “cute.” The platform then outputs images that hardly resemble adult women.

Dessi and similar AI platforms allow users to generate clothed images. But these websites are intended to create pornographic images. Thus, users of any age can customize childish-looking characters to appear naked and engaged in a variety of sexual activities, including “gangbang.” Furthermore, the absence of pubic hair is the default for AI-generated images. This mirrors the norm for pornography in general today and evokes a prepubescent state of physical development. Dessi also offers various facial expressions - sad, angry, shocked - which likewise suggest non-consensual and illegal sexual activity.

In what is likely an unauthorized use of a trademark, Dessi permits users to create what it calls “Pixar” images. This style is named after the animation studio famous for children’s movies such as *Toy Story*, *Finding Nemo*, *Ratatouille*, *The Incredibles*, *Inside Out*, *Up*, and *Monsters, Inc.* Here, again, we see the use of AI by the pornography industry to sexualize childhood.

Most AI platforms, too, create images in the style of Japanese animation or anime, known in its pornographic version as hentai. These images, too, typically resemble cartoonish children (see Dines and Sanchez, 2023). There is great demand for these sorts of images. One commercial online website that allows for limited free use is PornWorksAI. This platform uses a text-to-image algorithm. The website for PornWorksAI includes a massive free gallery of examples. Many of the ‘women,’ especially their faces, look younger than 18. The Terms of Service of this Bulgarian-registered company, Synergy Media, Inc., warns against images of

---

<sup>7</sup>These and other pornographic platforms and apps are not limited to any particular gender. But most users are male, and the websites I discuss are aimed at a predominantly male audience. For this reason, I use male pronouns. And pornography is, I add, despite protestations to the contrary by the industry, thoroughly heteronormative.

<sup>8</sup> Note that I provide links to many of these websites and companies solely for those who wish to verify my claims or see for themselves. These are not, in any way, endorsements. All links were valid as of 3 February 2025.

minors. But the gallery suggests that the platform is not especially vigilant in acting on that warning.

Users can purchase “pro” and “plus” services on PornWorksAI, using Visa, Mastercard, Google Pay, Venmo, and a slew of cryptocurrency exchanges. Users can also upload a photograph of any real person to incorporate the face in a fake pornographic image. No consent seems required. Would the program block a photo of a girl aged 14 or 17 – or even 6 or 7? We do not know.

Dessi or PornWorksAI are merely two out of hundreds of websites that allow users to freely create child-looking pornography. This problem is not restricted to a few rogue platforms. It is inherent across the industry. In 2024, in fact, the City of San Francisco, as discussed in the previous report, filed a lawsuit ([People v. Sol Ecom Inc.](#)) against more than two-dozen websites and apps for generating deepfake nudes. Nine of those websites created pornography of both adults *and* children, including [Pornngen.art](#), which is still operating. Users uploaded photos of actual minors, and the websites returned ‘undressed’ images of the children. Many of these companies, as the lawsuit noted, hide the identities of their owners. This cowardice is common across the industry.

On social media platforms like TikTok, pedophiles often post AI images of children who appear sexualized but not pornographic.<sup>9</sup> These accounts, while made by adults, often appear to be hosted by young people. Some of the photos receive thousands of ‘likes.’ The intent is for pedophiles to connect, then shift to an encrypted messaging app, such as Dubai-based Telegram, to exchange real child pornography in more secure digital spaces.

AI algorithms are also now used to generate images that *unambiguously* appear to depict the sexual abuse of teens, adolescents, and prepubescent children, including toddlers and infants. These images – which show men, for example, penetrating children – are proliferating online.<sup>10</sup> These fake images, to repeat, are generally indistinguishable from real images of child torture.

Perpetrators of AI child abuse often use the faces of real children, often known to them, or famous children. These deepfakes inflict real harm on individuals. Since it is well-nigh impossible to scrub the internet of images once they have circulated, these fakes can re-victimize children again and again. AI can also modify images of real child abuse, once again allowing for re-victimization. Additionally, the realism inherent in AI computer programs makes it difficult for law enforcement to identify real abuse. This makes it harder to prosecute physical abusers and to identify victims for necessary services.

## AI Childporn and the Law

Adults can legally view pornography in about 150 out of 194 countries. In most of them, however, it is nonetheless illegal to produce, sell, purchase, promote, distribute, and possess

---

<sup>9</sup>See, e.g., “[AI-generated kids draw predators on TikTok and Instagram](#),” *Forbes*, 28 May 2024.

<sup>10</sup>See, e.g., the [Cybertipline Report](#) by the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, and “[Public exposure to ‘chilling’ AI child sexual abuse images and videos increases](#),” Internet Watch Foundation, October 2024.

child pornography for commercial and sometimes even for private purposes.<sup>11</sup> Frequently, these laws arise from international treaties and agreements, including resolutions passed by the United Nations<sup>12</sup> and the European Union.<sup>13</sup>

In the US, every state criminalizes pornography when the user, as Massachusetts puts it, “knows” or “reasonably should know” that a minor is depicted.<sup>14</sup> In most cases, however, perpetrators are prosecuted under federal laws, which take precedence in which the perpetrator utilizes “any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce.” That clause includes the internet.

A suite of federal laws makes it illegal to lure or use minors in the creation or pornography.<sup>15</sup> It is also illegal to receive, solicit, swap, purchase, display, distribute, copy, advertise, and even possess images that you “know” or “should have known” depict children in “sexually explicit conduct.”<sup>16</sup> The penalties can be severe – upwards of 30 years in prison for each incident of some offense.<sup>17</sup> Like comparable legislation elsewhere, relevant US laws were codified before the era of artificial intelligence. In recent years, then, the federal law has expanded the definition of “child pornography” to include deepfake or computer-generated images of actual (i.e., identifiable) children engaged in sexual conduct which are “indistinguishable” from real images.<sup>18</sup> This revised definition also includes images that were modified from photos and videos of actual children.

What about realistic AI-generated pornographic images that do not depict real children and were not made from photos or videos of actual children? Those are also illegal under federal law if “an ordinary person viewing the depiction would conclude that the depiction is of an actual minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct that appear realistic.”<sup>19</sup> There is, however, a potential loophole. It is illegal to create realistic images of nonexistent children “with the intent to distribute” or by utilizing “interstate or foreign commerce,” which includes the internet. In this way, the law seemingly allows the creation of AI-generated fake but lifelike child porn for one’s own masturbatory use. Furthermore, federal charges and convictions in the US for AI-generated images of sexualized children are uncommon. Hence, the arrest of a man in May 2024 made worldwide news.<sup>20</sup> (He used the Stable Diffusion program mentioned earlier.) Here and in other recent cases, however, the main crimes were not so much the

---

<sup>11</sup>Nothing in this report should be construed as legal advice.

<sup>12</sup>[Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography](#), adopted 25 May 2000.

<sup>13</sup>See [EU strategy for a more effective fight against child sexual abuse](#), 2020

<sup>14</sup>“[Massachusetts law about obscenity and pornography](#),” Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

<sup>15</sup>See, e.g., “[Citizen’s Guide To U.S. Federal Law On Child Pornography](#)” by the U.S. Department of Justice.

<sup>16</sup>Defined as various types of sexual activity between persons as well as bestiality, masturbation, “sadistic or masochistic abuse,” and the “lascivious exhibition of the genitals or pubic area” ([18 U.S. Code § 2256](#)).

<sup>17</sup>There are a few exceptions, e.g., the defendant possessed less than three images, did not show anybody, and “promptly and in good faith” tried to destroy or reported them to law enforcement” ([18 U.S. Code § 2252A\(d\)](#)).

<sup>18</sup>See [18 U.S. Code § 2256 \(8\)\(b\)](#).

<sup>19</sup>See [18 U.S. Code § 2256\(11\)](#).

<sup>20</sup>“[Man arrested for producing, distributing, and possessing AI-generated images of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct](#),” U. S. Department of Justice, 20 May 2024. See also the “[Government’s Brief in Support of Detention](#)” USA v. Steven Anderegg.

creation of the images as other violations, such as posting and advertising the images on Instagram and Telegram, or secretly recording minors.<sup>21</sup> Several states themselves have recently criminalized the possession, accessing, *and* production of these sorts of images when there is the “intent to view,” as per [Wisconsin](#), and “the person knows, or reasonably should know, that the material contains a depiction of a purported child.” But the federal government has yet to pass equivalent legislation.<sup>22</sup>

What about images of children engaged in sexual activity that are not photorealistic, such as pornographic animation and hentai? In the US, those sorts of images often clash with the First Amendment to the Constitution: “Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech.” Hence, the law that bans photo-realistic depictions that are “indistinguishable” from an actual minor engaged in sexual activity expressly “does not apply drawings, cartoons, sculptures, or paintings.”<sup>23</sup> This loophole arises from a Supreme Court case. The 1996 Child Pornography Prevention Act prohibited computer-generated images and other pictures and drawings that show or appear to show minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct. But the Supreme Court struck down this provision of the law in 2002.<sup>24</sup> It was overly broad, and so would have banned certain Renaissance paintings. It would also have unconstitutionally suppressed lawful speech as the means to suppress unlawful speech.

In 2024, moreover, the Indiana Court of Appeals ruled that provisions of a state law enacted in 2022 that criminalized possession of animated child pornography was unconstitutional on the basis of the First Amendment because the images did not depict actual children.<sup>25</sup> The case pertained to a man charged with cartoon images in the style of hentai. This ruling was anchored to the 2002 Supreme Court decision, which I just discussed. In all, the legal landscape of non-photographic AI-depictions of what *could* amount to child pornography is in flux.

Still, a non-photographic picture of children engaged in sexual activity, such as the AI-generated types of images I showed above, could be ruled illegal if it is judged “obscene” or “lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.”<sup>26</sup> There would also need to be the “intent to distribute” or simply the use of the internet (via the interstate or foreign commerce clause discussed earlier). But obscenity charges are notoriously difficult to convict in the US since there is no precise legal definition of ‘obscenity.’<sup>27</sup> Hence, there are few prosecutions

---

<sup>21</sup> See “[Charlotte child psychiatrist is sentenced to 40 years in prison for sexual exploitation of a minor and using artificial intelligence to create child pornography images of minors](#),” U.S. Attorney’s Office, Western District of North Carolina, 8 November 2023, and “[Registered sex offender convicted of possessing child sexual abuse material](#),” U.S. Department of Justice, 15 November 2013.

<sup>22</sup> A bill in the House of Representatives (as of February 2024), [Child Exploitation and Artificial Intelligence Expert Commission Act of 2024](#), would establish a commission of experts to recommend solutions for better prevention, detection, and prosecution of AI pornography.

<sup>23</sup> [18 U.S. Code § 2256 \(11\)](#).

<sup>24</sup> [Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition](#), 535 U.S. 234 (2002).

<sup>25</sup> “[Appellate court reverses denial of Hendricks County man’s motion to dismiss child porn charges](#),” The Indiana Lawyer, 4 October 2024.

<sup>26</sup> [18 U.S. Code § 1466A](#).

<sup>27</sup> This is part of a much larger and complex legal discussion on various ways the courts have determined what is and is not ‘obscenity.’ See, e.g., [Citizen’s Guide To U.S. Federal Law On Obscenity](#), U. S. Department of Justice.



solely for AI-generated cartoonish or hentai images of minors engaged in sexual activity<sup>28</sup>, unless the person charged had also committed other crimes.<sup>29</sup>

At present, too, no federal law specifically targets the use of AI to ‘undress’ or ‘nudify’ photos of minors – especially if the app was used by another minor. A bill that would provide for a civil cause of action for monetary damages against perpetrators of deepfakes and similar digital forgeries is moving through the US Congress.<sup>30</sup> It would include, but does not focus on, children.

A provision of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2022 bars the sharing of intimate images.<sup>31</sup> Some minor victims of deepfakes and undressed images have used this statute to file civil lawsuits. These cases also typically cobble together other civil statutes against, say, the invasion of privacy or the intentional infliction of emotional distress.<sup>32</sup> But these laws, too, do not specifically pertain to minors.

Almost all the states have their own laws that bar deepfakes, regardless of age. In 2024, Massachusetts, one of the last holdouts, made it illegal to knowingly distribute digitized images, including deepfakes and modified images, depicting another identifiable person who appears nude, semi-nude, or engaged in sexual conduct.<sup>33</sup> This law, however, like those in many other states, requires an intent to harm (or its reckless disregard), and the same for the absence of consent. This allows a defendant to potentially escape prosecution by claiming, “It was just a joke...”

Many other countries also have laws against deepfakes and other AI-generated nude and pornographic images that purport to show minors and others even if they do not exist. In one way or another, these countries include the whole or states/provinces of Australia, Canada, Belgium, France, Italy, New Zealand, Ireland, and the UK.<sup>34</sup> Since most nations do not have an enshrined constitution protecting ‘free speech’ to the same broad degree as the US, it is often easier to target child pornography created by AI programs, even images that are cartoonish, hentai, or animation. But, as in the US, law enforcement generally pursues instances of real child abuse images, rather than AI fakes and hentai.<sup>35</sup> Thus, a man in the UK who used AI to turn photos of real children into child abuse images also shared and sold them online and tried to coax real children into sexual activity; he was sentenced to 18 years imprisonment in

---

<sup>28</sup> E.g., “‘Obscene’ U.S. manga collector jailed 6 months,” Wired, 12 February 2018. For views of Reddit users on this issue, see Eelmaa (2022). Reddit, I add, hosts groups with titles such as rape\_hentai, MechanicalSluts, and JerkOffToAnime.

<sup>29</sup> “Virginia man sentenced in landmark obscenity case,” FBI, 10 March 2016.

<sup>30</sup> The “Disrupt Explicit Forged Images and Non-Consensual Edits Act of 2024” or the “[DEFIANCE Act of 2024](#)”.

<sup>31</sup> [15 U.S. Code § 6851](#).

<sup>32</sup> “[New Jersey teen sues classmate for spreading fake AI nudes](#),” Daily Beast, 8 February 2024. The legal filing was [Jane Doe vs. K.G., 2:24-cv-00634](#).

<sup>33</sup> [An Act to Prevent Abuse and Exploitation](#), Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 20 June 2024.

<sup>34</sup> See, e.g., “[Worldwide Deepfake AI Laws](#),” Foundation RA, 2023.

<sup>35</sup> E.g., “[Tasmanian man charged over allegedly accessing anime child abuse material](#),” Australian Federal Police, 22 May 2024. He also had images of real child abuse.

2024.<sup>36</sup> In Ireland, by contrast, a young man was arrested for downloading hentai, but served only community service since he viewed the images “recklessly rather than intentionally.”<sup>37</sup>

## Sex Dolls

A long-standing sector of the pornography industry is the masturbatory sex doll. They have a long and often contested history (e.g., Ruberg, 2022). My focus here is on contemporary dolls made from synthetic materials, typically silicone or thermoplastic elastomer (TPE). As we will see, many of them are now outfitted with AI. These dolls, too, even without AI, serve as prototypes for sex robots.

There are male sex dolls, and cross-sex or trans dolls<sup>38</sup>. But the market overwhelmingly focuses on straight men who desire dolls that resemble the women seen in mainstream pornography (DeMaris & McGovern, 2023). Many doll owners, too, desire to have sex with prepubescent girls, which in reality is known as child rape.

The number of websites that sell these dolls is surprisingly large: Fantasy Wives, Honey Love Doll, NaughtyHarbor, SexDolls.com, Silicon Lovers, Rosemary Doll, Fair Dolls, Tenderdolls, The Doll Channel, Better Love Doll, My Robot Doll, and many more<sup>39</sup>. There are plenty of websites that review sex dolls.<sup>40</sup> The variety of brands is vast: American Sex Dolls, Silicon Wives, Sex Doll Genie, Joy Love, Doll Forever, Sino Doll, Gynoid Tech, Jiusheng Doll, Shedoll, Irontech, Dolls Castle, Climax Doll, GameLady Doll, Angel Kiss, Joyotoy, Firefly, and on and on. The dolls typically range in price from about \$1,000, even less sometimes, to upwards of \$10,000 and more.

There are sex dolls made for what appears to be most any fetish. Most dolls, too, are customizable (as can readily be seen simply by searching online for any of the stores or brands listed above). When ordering, the user selects from an array of choices to match his every whim: body shape, hair color, hair style, eye color, skin tone, fingernail and toenail colors, eyebrow style, bikini tan lines, tattoos, freckles, veins, removable tongue, and more. The breasts receive considerable attention. Users choose not only the dimensions, but also the size and color of the nipples and areolas. There are many options for the genitals, too, including the amount public hair, the color and size of the labia, and fixed or removable vagina (allegedly, one is easier to clean, the other provides “better feeling”). Upgrades include gel breasts, “vaginal channel texture,” internal heating, moaning devices triggered by pressure or touch, and “real oral sex” head.

Most companies also sell torsos, lacking limbs and sometimes a head, but still possessing a penetrable vagina and anus. There is also a cottage industry of accessories: cleaning kits, UV germicidal heating rods, vaginal dryers, display stands, heart shape pubic hair wigs, spare

---

<sup>36</sup> “[Man who made ‘depraved’ child images with AI jailed](#),” BBC, 28 October 2024.

<sup>37</sup> “[Young man caught with ‘cartoon’ images of child pornography avoids jail](#),” Donegal Daily, 2 February 2023.

<sup>38</sup> Also called “futanari” (“futa”) dolls, a Japanese term typically referring to a female-looking person with a penis.

<sup>39</sup> For photos of dolls in production, see Crist (2017).

<sup>40</sup> E.g., [The Best and Most Realistic Sex Dolls in 2025](#); [A Comprehensive Review of the Best Sex Dolls in 2024](#).

vagina inserts (“make cleaning after sex quicker and easier”), USB vagina heater, vampire teeth, attachable ‘shemale’ kits, “silicone removable vaginas with labia,” and more.

Racism is rampant, as in pornography generally. The online emporium [YourDoll](#) offers Asian sex dolls, “to satisfy any pipe dream.” [SnDoll](#) sells more than 4,000 dolls from 30 brands. Among the names are not only phrases such as Huge Boobs, Sister, and Mom, but also Pocahontas, Mulatto, and Ghetto Booty.

The gold standard is [Real Doll](#), which can retail for more than \$11,000. RealDoll offers 36 different faces in addition to the typical range of shapes, styles, sizes, and colors. One doll reportedly makes a spanking sound when hit.<sup>41</sup> Another option is the wireless vaginal insert that detects touch and insertion to “transmit audio feedback to any paired audio source.” It has multiple voices.

Many sex doll stores and brands maintain social media accounts on X (Twitter), Instagram, YouTube, Facebook, Vimeo, Pinterest, Flickr, and other platforms. One can find online a magazine, [CoverDoll](#), and various user forums. In late 2024, I clicked on several, including [Doll Harem](#). I saw numerous images of men having sex with their dolls. A favorite photographic genre seems to be a doll oozing ejaculate.

How do you pay for sex dolls? Most online vendors prominently display the logos of at least some of the following: PayPal, Visa, Mastercard, American Express, Discover, JCB, Google Pay, Apple Pay, Diners Club, Shop Pay, Klarna, Stripe, and various cryptocurrencies and crypto exchanges. This is not an underground economy. It is made possible by major financial institutions.

Amazon is also a major retailer for the industry, selling sex dolls and sex torsos as well as assorted novels and how-to books. Most are self-published. Titles include *Sex Doll Photobook*, *Shelled Nuts Sex Doll: A Femdom Castration Novella*, *Cuckolded by a Sex Robot*, *Taken By the Delivery Drone*, and *The Blacker the Robot the Moister the Oyster: Falling for the Obamacare Sex Robot*.

One researcher claims that most doll owners value a “cherishing relationship” with their dolls (Devlin 2020). The CEO of RealDoll agrees. He professed in one interview to abhor the focus on sex since most owners, he stated, want only a companion for “cuddling” or “watching a movie in bed” (Devlin & Locatelli, 2020, 84). If you view the RealDoll website, however, you will see little cuddling, but ample close-ups of dolls’ naked breasts and fully shaved genitals. And, elsewhere, even the CEO is more truthful about why men desire sex dolls:

...because it’s totally silent and basically submissive. It does whatever you want...and [you] hear no complaints. The other thing to consider is that these dolls are physically beautiful and how many guys out there really get to be with a woman who looks that good? (Lane, 1999)

---

<sup>41</sup>“[Why we should worry about the sex robot with a ‘resist’ function](#),” *Vice*, 6 September 2017.

Plus, “the sensations that you get from the silicone are actually better than the real thing.” That is why so many men desire sex dolls. They despise real women, preferring instead what they see in pornography.

## AI Sex Dolls and Robots

Tech firms are increasingly adding AI technology to sex dolls, linked to mechanical devices. Known as sexbots, gynoids, fembots, and other neologisms, these dolls converse with users, respond to voice prompts, change facial expression, feign sexual pleasure, learn the user’s personality through self-learning algorithms, and download information from the internet. Some companies, too, are developing fully mobile and functional sex robots. AI is the future of porn.

[Smart Doll World](#) advertises, “Our lifelike AI sex robot doll can hold a non-sexual or sexual conversation with you. Her responsive head, eyes, mouth, and lip movements are so lifelike you will forget she is a doll.” They are self-learning. Kimberly, on sale now for the base price of \$3,670, has an optional feature so “you can make her say exactly what you want.” Sonya “recognizes almost 50 sexually intimate questions and will respond...in a very sexy voice.”<sup>42</sup> Samantha “can remember things and when you get her excited she will respond with moans and dirty talk.” Needless to say, reported the company founder, “it doesn’t take much for Samantha to respond.”<sup>43</sup>

The dolls sold by [Aini Doll](#) harness cloud-based AI for “non-sexual and sexual conversations interactively...she’s able to recognize your voice and respond the way you want.” The robotic head smiles and winks; the lips sync to the voice; her sensors “react to the levels of touch or even penetration.” [Robot Companion](#) also sells similar AI sex dolls. Michelle has animated eyes, a head that tilts and rotates, and answers questions by connecting through Wi-Fi to the Internet.

Only a few true sex robots have come to market. Yet they have captivated scholars, the media, and also mainstream porn. One of the top trending searches on Pornhub, according to its [2023 Year in Review](#), was “android.” This, as much as anything, shows that sexbots are really ‘pornbots’ (Richardson, 2022), much as child sex dolls are in actuality “child sex abuse dolls” (Roper, 2022, 12-23). They are not the vanguard of an exciting posthuman era that many academics celebrate (e.g., Schussler, 2020). They are an old misogyny repackaged as “posthuman sexism” (Robertson, 2010).

The best-known AI sex robot is [Harmony](#), made by RealDoll. Everything about her, like all sex robots, resembles the same misogynistic distortions promoted by mainstream pornography for decades.<sup>44</sup> With “customizable AI software...[that] allows you to create unique personalities,” Harmony, like all sex robots and sex dolls, materializes Western

---

<sup>42</sup>They give this example: “Do you want me baby” “Yes I need you inside me now. I want to feel your manhood...”

<sup>43</sup>“[Engineer creates sex robot that needs to be romanced first](#),” HuffPost, 17 March 2017.

<sup>44</sup>See, e.g., “[State of the sexbot market: The world’s best sex robot and AI sex doll companies](#)” posted on the Future of Sex website in September 2023.

patriarchal heterosexuality (e.g., Atanasoski & Vora, 2020; Nazlıpınar Subaşı, 2023). She is the digital embodiment of the Stepford Wife, a woman intended to serve.<sup>45</sup>

That same misogyny may expand to other arenas of robots. RealDoll is now owned by a publicly traded robotics firm, RealBotix.<sup>46</sup> The company still sells sexbots. But it is taking its future on robotics in general. This suggests that the pornographic ‘base learning’ of RealDoll might someday find its way into other areas of society, such as medicine. Similarly, [DS Dolls](#), which currently sells only sex robots, will soon unveil “service robots” to welcome visitors to offices, stores, and events. Likewise, [Luxbotix](#) sells robots to serve as waiters, information desk staff, nannies, security, and spelling tutors. It is unclear why any of these roles requires “functional genitalia.”<sup>47</sup> The sister site of Luxbotix, which expressly sells sex robots, is called [Artificial Wives](#). The idea that pornography will be part of the underlying algorithm for a ‘service robot’ is not reassuring.

Sex robots are advertised as the “perfect girlfriend...who provides sex, household service, company, and adoration while remaining submissive” (Andreallo, 2022). These devices are designed “to serve and satisfy.” They cater to a man’s needs; they do not teach men how to relate to real women who, after all, have their own needs. Thus, sex robots reinforce male entitlement over women, the “lust to dominate and control” (Tonna-Barthet, 2018, 26).

Yet most scholars who write on sex robots and sex dolls dismiss or ignore these harms (e.g., Balistreri, 2022; Hanson 2023; Björkas & Larsson, 2021; Locatelli 2022; Desbuleux & Fuss, 2023). They often go to great lengths to defend sex robots (e.g., Kubes 2019; Dubé and Ancil, 2021). Some of these putatively academic publications read like infomercials (e.g., Belk, 2022), including what is probably the best-known book on the topic (Levy, 2009). There are too few contrary voices. One is feminist activist Caitlin Roper (2022). Another is Kathleen Richardson (2022), Professor of Ethics and Culture of Robots and AI and founder of the [Campaign Against Sex Robots](#) (see also Van Grunsven, 2022).<sup>48</sup>

Little about sex dolls and sex robots suggests the ‘queering’ of conventional categories of gender and sexuality, as per academic orthodoxy (e.g., Rigotti, 2020; Dudek & Young, 2022; DeFalco, 2023; Power, 2020). Anybody who spends even two minutes on a sex robot or sex doll website will readily see that these devices cater only to unreal, pornographic fantasies.

## Anguish Coupled to Misogyny

Why would someone, typically a man, purchase a sex doll or robot? Why spend thousands of dollars to ejaculate in a silicone representation of a woman? The answers are unsettling.

---

<sup>45</sup>The allusion is to Ira Levin’s 1972 novel, *The Stepford Wives* and the 1975 film with the same title.

<sup>46</sup>“[Realbotix aims to shed X-rated past with crypto-funded pivot to AI and robots](#),” The Logic, 10 July 2024

<sup>47</sup> Since I first visited the website in 2024, the company has split, one division for business, the other for “adult companions.”

<sup>48</sup>Other useful sources, even if some are laudatory, are Oravec (2022), Nyholm (2022), Döring et al. (2020), González-González et al. (2021), Hanson & Locatelli (2022), Meridian et al. (2022), Wosk (2024), and Kleeman (2020, Part I).



Unlike real women, as we have seen, sex dolls and sex robots are customized to the precise specifications of the user. The options reflect an obsessive, voyeuristic, stalker-like focus on every intimate detail of women's bodies, all refracted through the distorted lens of mainstream pornography. These devices appeal to men who see women not as whole persons but as mere assortments of disembodied and disconnected physical features, each intended for male pleasure.

Sex robots and dolls, like mainstream pornography, too, as I stated earlier, appeal to men who do not actually like, if not despise real women. In its [Ultimate Sex Dolls Guide for 2025](#), YourDoll states, "you'll enjoy the physical and emotional release that sex with a real woman usually provides." The message is clear. Unlike real women, sexbots are always ready and willing to satisfy men. The rabidly misogynistic website for [SexDolls-USA](#) makes this perfectly clear: "Let's be honest guys, in the past year alone, how many hundreds of dollars have you blown over impressing girls just trying to get laid?"<sup>49</sup> A sex doll is better than a woman. You pay for her dinner once, as it were, and she never says no.

These devices also appeal to men who enjoy the objectification of prostitution, whereby women are commodities to be bought, sold, and used at will. As doll owners said:

"In real life women have fewer redeeming qualities. Relationships with dolls are superior."

"No one's feelings, or anus gets hurt."

"A partner that can be ignored for as long as wanted without feeling bad."

"You essentially get this ageless perfect girl who will love you unconditionally and never be too busy for you."

These voices were reported in an academic article which nonetheless offered one condemnation (Langcaster-James & Bentley, 2018, 10-11). Neither did the authors of another paper that reported one doll owner saying, "I can get what I want immediately...Because with someone else you have to respect them" (Lievesley, Reynolds, & Harper, 2023).

We read similar voices in Roper (2022, 84-86), who, as noted earlier, has the moral integrity to flag misogyny. Unlike women, said the men on various online sex doll forums, a doll:

"...will wait for you patiently, days or weeks at a time, with nary a complaint"

"...lets you have the first and last word"

"...gives me her full, and undivided attention"

---

<sup>49</sup>That same webpage features a closeup photo of the crotch of sex doll or woman, her underwear, which are pulled down slightly, prominently display the image of Hello Kitty

"No emotional baggage, no personality conflicts, no headaches, no attitudes and the list goes on and on. Not to mention that [dolls] don't tend to get out of shape or gain any weight!!"

A self-published pamphlet by a doll owner, available for free on Amazon Kindle,<sup>50</sup> called his sex dolls "quiet wives." They "never rage or gripe...never say that you are not treating her pleasant...can be controlled any way you need...never says no to anything."

It is no surprise that one study found that doll owners feel sexually entitled and see women as sexual objects (Harper, Lievesley, & Wanless, 2023). But, of course, women in pornography and prostitution do not act willingly. They are coerced or threatened into following a script. By contrast, "in real life, women really have their own thoughts and feelings and preferences and desires"<sup>51</sup> (Richardson, quoted in Jackson Gee, 2017). Too many men fear female agency, however. They have "a reactive desire to see...women infantilized, undressed and subordinate," as Kinsella (2000, 122) remarks for many adult male consumers of manga. The president of a Japanese sex doll company offered confirmation: "Nowadays, women are sometimes more dominant than men in the real world, and they don't always pay attention to men...we're making these dolls partly in support of [these] men."<sup>52</sup> Of course, this, like virtual child pornography (Levy, 2002), is the "eroticization of inequality".

Sex robots, like pornography, give men the allusion of absolute power over women in another way. The sounds emitted from the 'moaning devices' attached to many sex dolls, I suggest, allow men to fantasize that their very touch commands a woman to ecstasy.

Some suggest the use of robots in prisons to stem sexual violence (Dewitte & Reisman, 2021, 368). It is far more likely that sex dolls would strengthen the view that men can force sex onto others. Others argue that sex robots could serve people on the autism spectrum (e.g., Pasciuto, Cava, & Falzone, 2023), or "care" for the elderly, the disabled, and those with diminished intellectual capacities (Fosch-Villaronga & Poulsen, 2020; Jecker, 2021). These suggestions are immoral (Sparrow, 2021).

Also immoral, as well as untrue, is the claim by [Sexindoll](#) that their devices can "cure depression and improve mental health." [Xtorso](#), which sells disembodied sex torsos, makes similar claims. In fact, one paper which defended sex robots still reported that pornography consumption as well as "self-reports of depression, social anxiety, attention deficit disorder" were correlated with "more positive attitudes toward sex robots" (Brandon & Planke, 2021, 77). If sex robots were designed for therapeutic purposes, they would debut at a medical or psychological conference, not the annual pornography trade show in Las Vegas.<sup>53</sup> One debut featured MissDoll Swallow, a robotic AI head. When told to go faster, reported Roper (2022, 7), MissDoll Swallow replied, "Yes, Master."

---

<sup>50</sup>"[Orient female sex dolls: The silicone pleasure with guidelines on uses and maintenance.](#)"

<sup>51</sup>Kathleen Richardson, quoted in "[Why female sex robots are more dangerous than you think](#)," *The Telegraph*, 5 July 2017.

<sup>52</sup>"[Japan's lonely hearts turn to dolls for sex company](#)," *Reuters*, 9 August 2007

<sup>53</sup>As per *PC Magazine*, "[Roxxy the 'sex robot' debuts at AVN porn show](#)," 9 January 2020.

Some men, too, desire sex dolls and sex robots because they are unable or unwilling to recognize that intimate relationships between adults entail more than just sex. These devices are marketed at men who want, as YourDoll [states](#), “the avoidance of responsibilities.” These devices thus appeal to infantile desires (see also Massa et al., 2021). They regress adult men to a stage where one receives and never gives, where the only thing that matters is the self. But while infants grow, sex dolls stagnate the self. They do not teach empathy, how to consider another person’s perspective, how to honor someone else’s needs (Knafo & Lo Bosco, 2017). These devices foster what Ray (2016, 106) calls “an extreme form of solipsistic narcissism.”

Davecat, a famous sex doll owner often featured in documentaries about robosexuals,<sup>54</sup> considers himself married to a doll.<sup>55</sup> He prefers “Synthetik” to “Organik” intimacy (Knafo & Lo Bosco, 2017, chap 3). Davecat admits to “trust issues.” A doll, unlike women, “will never cheat...will always be there for me...I won’t have to worry about her manipulating my emotions...I won’t be lied to...she’ll never criticize me.” And, of course, she is ready for sex “at any time.”

He is not alone. Many sex doll owners report forging emotional attachments to their dolls (Ciambrone et al., 2017). The house is “warm.” Life is “fuller.” One man enjoys “taking care of her.” Consider these voices reported by Lancaster-James & Bentley (2018):

“Physical human contact has always given me a lot of anxiety...I felt lonely and very depressed, but did not want the burden of a relationship.”

“I live with mental illness...I decided to see if this doll might help me create the true life I always wanted”.

“I write her love letters and read them to her”

Knafo & Lo Bosco (2017, 76) report another sad man saying, “Anything can become alive if you’re lonely enough.” In fact, 25% of the men in one survey said they “love” their dolls (Aoki & Kimura, 2021). Many, too, say their dolls love them.

Clearly, these men struggle with loss, pitiful self-esteem, social immaturity, a childish view of relationships, and emotional pain.<sup>56</sup> They are also beholden to a virulently misogynistic understanding of women and female sexuality (see also Peschka and Raab, 2022). No amount of algorithmic pornography can cure their afflictions. The sex doll and sex robot industry is predatory. These men need genuine therapy, not artificial women with vaginal texture options who can feign conversation.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>Such as “Guys and Dolls,” released by the BBC in 2007 and shown in the US as “Love Me, Love My Doll.” I found the documentary painfully sad.

<sup>55</sup>I am aware of no country that allows legal marriage to a doll, robot, AI device, or any other object.

<sup>56</sup>They may also experience “objectophilia,” the diagnostic term for a romantic or sexual attraction to objects, which, as a quick Google search will reveal, can include airplanes and buildings. There is some evidence that objectophilia is linked to autism and synesthesia (Simner et al., 2019; Gatzia & Arnaud, 2022).

<sup>57</sup>Most academic proponents of sex robots and sex dolls display an inexcusable lack of compassion towards the men who have sex with these devices, and a flimsy view of the human psyche, which amounts almost to research

## Violence and Rape

None of this is to excuse the violence of AI pornography and sexual devices. This is why chatter that sex robots could help incels is untenable. Incels are not fueled by the desire for sex. They are driven by misogyny (Bates, 2020).<sup>58</sup> Hence, Hanson's (2023) claim that men who role-play as their dolls on cyber-forums to "feel more comfortable engaging in feminine behaviors" lacks merit. Only through a misogynist lens can a sex doll be equated at any level with real women.

One doll owner said, "You always have...a compliant partner for kinks/fetishes that may be too much for living partners" (Langcaster-James & Bentley, 2018, 10). Yet, a "downside to dolls," reported one man on an online forum, "is that they cannot of their own accord get a striated red ass, back or thighs from a spanking/whipping" (Roper, 2022, 66-69). Another said he enjoys "torturing" his dolls. Roper (2022, 20-21) reports even more chilling comments:

"both robots and modern women can't cook but at least the robot spreads the legs every time"

"One thing for sure, these robots won't have the word 'rape' in their vocabulary."<sup>59</sup>

We can see this violence on mainstream pornographic websites, or 'tube sites,' which allow users to upload their own video clips. On Pornhub in late 2024, the Doll-Destroyer channel had over one million views. The SubmissiveDolls channel had ten times that amount - an enormous audience that literally 'gets off' on watching fantasies of misogyny.<sup>60</sup>

Knafo & Lo Bosco (2017, 17) report one doll owner who "sometimes became angry and forceful with his compliant doll when he recalled the real women who had caused him pain and disgrace. His reactions scared him." A sex robot was put on display in 2017 at the Arts Electronica Festival in Austria. So many attendees grabbed, groped, and "mounted" the doll that it was left in tatters (Illes & Udwadia, 2019).<sup>61</sup> In the UK, reported the same article, a decapitated and mutilated sex doll was discarded in a bush.<sup>62</sup>

Another form of violence perpetuated by sex robots and sex dolls, as well as deepfakes, is the assumption that consent is unnecessary. Women are there for the taking, by any man, at any time. Some advocates of sex robots believe these devices will eradicate prostitution and sex trafficking (e.g., Yeoman & Mars, 2012). If anything, sex robots will fuel the desire for prostitution since these devices, like prostitution and pornography, disrupt "empathy,

---

misconduct (e.g., Su et al., 2019; Lievesley, Reynolds, & Harper, 2023; Hanson, 2021; Karaian, 2022; Burr-Miller & Aoki, 2013; Devlin & Locatelli, 2020).

<sup>58</sup>See also the Culture Reframed report, "[Pornography in the Incelosphere](#)" and "[Sexbots aren't the answer to misogynist incel rage](#)," *Salon*, 4 May 2018.

<sup>59</sup>This rebuts the statement, "My guess is that, for a lot of the current opponents of sex dolls, sex dolls would feel less dangerous or damaging to society if we take the experiences of such current users into account" (van Voorst, 2022, 58).

<sup>60</sup>The tale of the ivory statue hewn by Pygmalion, as told by Ovid, contains nuances of incest and sexual violence (Liveley, 2019). The term for the erotic desire for a statute or similar is 'agalmatophilia.'

<sup>61</sup>See also "[Sex robot molested at electronics festival, creators say](#)," *Huffpost*, 29 September 2017.

<sup>62</sup>See also "[Sex doll 'SLAUGHTER': Mutilated and DECAPITATED figure found dumped in bushes](#)," *Daily Star*, 25 March 2018; and, more generally, Ehrenkranz (2016).

because the buyer of sex is not relating to the person as a subject, but an object” (Richardson 2015; 2016, 49).<sup>63</sup> Sex robots would further harm prostituted women, too, by equating them with “rented machines” (Johnson & Verdicchio 2020, 421). There are, in fact, a few sex doll brothels. The dolls are treated sadistically (Delicado-Moratalla, 2022). This, in turn, would negatively impact *all* women.

The selling point of a sex robot and sex doll is sex on demand, in the absence of any consent. These devices, then, will habituate users to expect that women and girls should also act like ‘sexual slaves.’ No less dangerous is the argument that sex robot brothels could teach the importance of consent by requiring men to level-up on ‘conversation points’ before they can have sex.<sup>64</sup> It is true that some virtual girlfriends require conversation before they submit. But it is largely perfunctory (Davis, 2018, 31). This way, they teach boys and men that a woman’s refusal can be overcome if you just take the time and effort to ‘win her over’ (see also Gutiu, 2016, 206; Kaufman 2020, 38).

Most sex robots and AI sex dolls are not programmed with any sophisticated consideration of consent. They are programmed to yield (but see Peeters & Haselager, 2021). The sex robot made by [AI-TECH](#) can schedule appointments and manage household devices. She has facial recognition and “can also interact with users on a more personal level by recognizing individual preferences and adapting its behaviors accordingly.” Elsewhere, she is described as “reluctant to say ‘No’ to any of your requests and that’s what makes her such a delightful companion.” Most users, too, do not want AI sex devices that require cajoling. They find it annoying (Roper, 2022, 87-88).

Even more concerning is that some men might desire sex robots that refused consent in order to enact rape fantasies. They would enjoy overpowering the robot. Or, as per Sparrow (2017), it is likely that some robotics companies would program sex robots with a special ‘rape’ setting. It could trigger the robot to respond to the user’s advances with verbal and gestural messages to ‘stop,’ but eventually express pleasure. These scenarios are not far-fetched. Rape-like scenarios are common in mainstream pornography. Many porn sites, moreover, purport to show videos of actual rapes. The issue here is not whether it makes sense to speak of the ‘rape’ of a robot, or the degree to which a robot has the moral status of a person.<sup>65</sup> The issue is how sex robots could be seen by some men as condoning nonconsensual sexuality.<sup>66</sup>

According to news reports, the now-defunct robot company, [True Companion](#), sold a sex robot called Roxxy. She offered buyers three sexual “inputs” as well as “unconditional love” for almost \$10,000.<sup>67</sup> (Roxxy had a male counterpart, Rocky. He was not described as

---

<sup>63</sup>Many defenders of sex robots naïvely diminish the harms of both prostitution and pornography (e.g., Hancock, 2020; Klein & Lin, 2018; DiTecco & Karaian, 2023).

<sup>64</sup>As reported in “[Can sex robots give consent?](#),” *Rolling Stone*, 26 November 2018.

<sup>65</sup>For useful Jewish and Confucian perspectives, see Sinclair, Dowdeswell, & Goltz (2023) and Fan & Cherry (2021).

<sup>66</sup>See also – although I do not endorse all they say – Frank & Nyholm (2017), Eskens (2017), Jecker (2023), and “[The squishy ethics of sex with robots](#),” *Wired*, 2 February 2018.

<sup>67</sup>Widespread media coverage included “[‘Sex robots with ‘resistance setting’ let men simulate rape and should be outlawed, say campaigners](#),” *The Independent*, 22 September 2017.



possessing an ‘output’ on par with Roxxy’s “inputs.” But “his manhood” was, as expected, “really big.” Roxxy had multiple personalities,<sup>68</sup> including “Frigid Farrah.” She was programmed to initially react coolly to an “advance,” but eventually caved. Many people rightly saw the robot as legitimizing rape or coercive sex (see Bates 2017). Sex robots, then, are simply old wine – the exploitation of women (e.g., Wolf 2021) – in new silicone skin.

Artificial Wives, which I mentioned earlier, will customize a sex robot to [resemble a person in a photo](#). They do not mention consent. Many sex dolls, too, are named after famous women who clearly did not give consent (see also Lancaster, 2021) – such as “Hillary Clinton” and “Meghan Markle.” In fact, at least one lawsuit has been filed against a sex doll company, IronTech Dolls, for the unauthorized likeness of a model.<sup>69</sup> These dolls and robots teach men that consent is unnecessary to ‘own’ a woman for your own purposes. And they teach girls and women to behave accordingly.

## Child Sex Dolls and Robots

[Aini Doll](#), a US-based company, sells custom-made robotic and AI sex dolls, which they call “companion dolls,” that “combined the best features of the female mind and body.” Various options include “robotic hips, robotic vagina and robotic BJ functions.” The website says, “No minor sex dolls.” But if you visit their page of “[cutie](#)” dolls, or look at the company’s [YouTube](#) channel (they also have a presence on Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter), many of their products shockingly resemble prepubescent girls. The company, based in Boston, profits from what looks like child pornography.

Various financial companies also profit from these underage-looking sex dolls, including Klarna, the payment platform based in Stockholm, as well as Visa, Maestro, and Mastercard, which do business with Klarna. Aini Doll, too, displays the Discover Card logo on its homepage.

In April 2024, the company [announced](#) that it would cease offering “small dolls,” since they “can be controversial” and “misunderstandings surrounding these products have begun to impact our business.” Although they affirmed, “Our focus is always on creating lifelike, comforting companions with nothing to do with inappropriate intent,” they still sell dolls that allow men to feign sex with young girls.

Many other robotic and non-robotic sex doll companies also peddle the allusion of raping children. The dolls ‘trending’ in January 2025 on the [Silver Doll](#) website, based in Guangzhou City, China, included “Utia in school uniform” and “Betty at school” (as well as “Helena tied up and gagged”). Many of their “minidolls” have the bodies of adult women, but faces of anime-like girls. They partner with PayPal, Visa, Mastercard, UPS, and FedEx.

It is certainly true that some women possess thin physiques, small breasts, and diminutive stature. But sex dolls that are advertised with these characteristics – mini dolls, small chested skinny dolls, and the like – are not intended to celebrate diversity. They are aimed at men who

---

<sup>68</sup>There is some controversy if Roxxy actually existed as she was marketed (e.g., Devlin, 2018, 145).

<sup>69</sup>“[Israeli woman sues after unwittingly inspiring a sex doll](#),” The Times of Israel, 11 January 2022.

yearn to have sex with children. This is especially so when the doll is dressed in clothing that normally appears on young women or girls.

YourDoll sells “Adult Anime Asian Cute Real Silicone Sex Doll Chiaki.” Despite the label “adult,” her facial features [resemble a child](#). Another doll on the website displays pigtails with ribbons and wears a Hello Kitty shirt. The site also shows dolls dressed in school uniforms; one wears a halter top and panties that say “Lolita.” [HaniDoll](#) offers a sex doll “featuring small breasts...to look and feel just like a real young college girl...innocent...blushing cheeks.” And on and on. And all these dolls, I stress, are made to be penetrated – so there is no mistaking their intended use.

[XNDOLL](#) offers many categories of sex dolls, including Skinny, Flat Chested, and Young. Many of their dolls are dressed like stereotypical Asian school girls or in sailor outfits, typically with the ‘cute’ face of anime girls: large open eyes, tiny noses, small mouths, pouty expression, large bows in their hair, and so forth. The “flat chested dolls” for sale by [Pi Doll](#), a company with an address in California, boasts that they use high-quality thermoplastics elastomers, “for the health of users.” But the dolls they display on their website so shockingly resemble young girls that the real harm their products pose are to the potential victims of child molesters.

Next time you reach for your wallet or purse, know that Visa, Mastercard, and other credit cards conduct business with Pi Doll. These major banks also provide financial transactions with [SexDollxxx](#). One of its many child-looking dolls is described as having “a fairy-tale face...alongside sexual orifices...she’ll stay young and fresh if you take good care of her.” [Petite Sex Doll](#) of China and Hong Kong similarly sells sex dolls that resemble prepubescent girls, such as the “flat chest sweetie mini sex doll.” They accept bank transfers and cryptocurrency payments as well as Visa, Mastercard, Diners Club, and Discover. Their dolls, as per the pornographic norm, can be ordered without pubic hair. You can also add a “moaning system,” so the fantasy of raping a child can be made to sound like she is enjoying it.

Petite Sex Doll also sells anime dolls, which resemble cartoon characters modelled after young girls. They possess “3 holes (anal, vaginal, oral) for your ultimate sex pleasure.” One anime doll, [Nahida](#), a character in a video game (Genshin Impact) who inhabits the body of a 14-16-year-old, “will gladly do anything if you want to make her kneel, get down on all fours, or lay her down and spread her legs wide.” Equally extreme is Hong Kong-based [ALDOLL](#), which sells sex dolls with “undeveloped breasts, do you like this type?” The website shows logos for Visa, Mastercard, American Express, Discover, and PayPal. ALDOLL, too, has a presence on Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest, and Instagram.

What about Amazon? Only in 2018 did the giant retailer stop the sale of child sex dolls, and then only after widespread criticism.<sup>70</sup> Yet Amazon continues to sell sex dolls that are dressed like young teens, even if they are described as “adult” or “full size.” Amazon too sells a sex doll with a “prolapse uterus.”

---

<sup>70</sup>“[Amazon pulls child sex dolls after criticism from UK watchdog](#),” Reuters, 12 April 2018.

Horribly, some child sex doll manufacturers will custom-make dolls to resemble a photo of a real child (Roper, 2022, 161; Giard, 2017). In this way, a man could pretend to rape a neighboring child. This is not far-fetched. For several months in 2024, I received daily Google alerts for “pornography.” Most of the news items pertained to child images. Many involved men using AI to modify photos of children they knew, including a sheriff’s deputy and a school employee.<sup>71</sup>

To many men, writes Cassidy (2016, 207), a sex doll:

solves patriarchy’s paradoxical desire of a woman at once Mary and Magdalene—the fidelity of the virgin coupled with the gratification of the whore. iDollators can dress their dolls to resemble porn stars while being assured of their purity.

This is especially true for child-like sex dolls. But since minors are unable legally to consent to sexual activity with adults, we need to not lose sight of the fact that these dolls simulate the rape of a child.

In fact, many companies add simulated hymens to sex dolls that perforate or break upon penetration. Virgin dolls are sold by [ULoversDoll](#), [Aurora Dolls](#) (“a unique journey into intimacy”), as well as [OkSexDoll](#), which states that this type of doll may “imitate the appearance of a young woman.” My Robot Doll also sells virgin sex dolls; they look younger than 18. The company accepts all major credit cards. YourDoll called the “[new hymen styles](#)” an “upgraded sexual experience.” “The best part,” said [SexInDoll](#), “is that your doll comes as a virgin in a world where virgin girls are hard to find.”

Dolls with simulated hymens do not, as far as I know, currently include AI. But they surely will. And just as surely, judging from the general ethos of the pornography industry, these dolls will likely cry with pain as the owner penetrates them.

## Will Sex Dolls and Sex Robots Curb Abuse?

A well-known [sex doll repairman](#) has seen dolls with jaws broken, fingers ripped off, breasts severed, vaginas mutilated, and more. In the documentary, *Love Me, Love My Doll*, the same sex doll repairman said, “I had one guy...who had sex so hard with his doll that he ripped the leg off it. Her calves, from below the knee, had what looked almost like knife puncture wounds. Hundreds of them.” Of course, the dolls cannot cry out with pain and agony, or call for help. “Hence, the aggressor may become habituated to the effects of applying sexual and physical harm on a nonconsensual partner and escalate the attacks” to real children and women (Maras and Shapiro, 2017, 5). In his way, as I argued above, the entire sex doll, sex robot, and AI pornographic industries, like pornography in general, reinforce the view that children and women, as Maras and Shapiro continued (p. 16), “are compliant, obedient, ever-available and submissive when it comes to sex, and if they are not, they should be.”

---

<sup>71</sup> “[Former McKenzie County Sheriff’s deputy facing felony charges of child pornography](#),” KX News, 24 December 2024; “[Texas school janitor accused of using AI to create child porn with faces of real students](#),” NBC 15 News, 18 October 2024.

In the previous report (mentioned above), I discussed adults who dress like children and engage in simulated child rape in virtual reality. This is innocuously called 'ageplay,' but it is hardly playful. I also discussed that actual children sometimes use their own VR characters or avatars, which are identified as children, to sell in-game sexual activities to adults for game-specific currency. Some academics downplay the seriousness or implications of these activities (e.g., Reeves, 2018). But here, again, we see that AI reinforces the view that children are the legitimate prey for sexual predators.

The Japanese owner of a child sex doll company called Trottla admitted to his sexual attraction to children.<sup>72</sup> Some of his dolls resemble five-year-old girls (Richardson, 2016, 48), as you can verify for yourself by visiting his [website](#) (see also Roper, 2022, 12-23). The owner of Trottla claims that his dolls help men with their "fetishes."

Could sex dolls and sex robots help in the treatment of pedophiles – giving them a safe outlet – as some scholars advocate (Behrendt, 2018; Zhou, 2019; see also Bernstein, 2023)? Patrick Lin, a philosopher at California Polytechnic, offers a useful analogy: "Imagine treating racism by letting a bigot abuse a brown robot. Would that work? Probably not. The ethics of sex robots goes beyond whether anyone is physically harmed" (Foundation for Responsible Robotics, 2017, 27). It would send a message that society condones, rather than censors, child sexual abuse.

When we address this issue empirically, we find no evidence that the masturbatory use of robots and dolls will protect children. Even supporters of the idea have gathered no evidence that "dolls have a protective effect on the behavioral level" (Desbuleux & Fuss, 2024a, 1272). Some apologists for sex robots, too, find the idea dangerous (e.g., Danaher, 2019b). In fact, a man arrested for illegally bringing a child sex doll into the UK also had videos on his computer showing the rape of real children.<sup>73</sup> The doll did not quench his thirst for child abuse. But the notion persists.

Two authors who endorse the concept (Harper and Lievesly, 2022) were funded by the Prostagia Foundation, a quasi-civil rights group for "minor attracted persons."<sup>74</sup> But even those two authors found "a greater level of hypothetical enjoyment in abusing a child" among pedophiles who owned dolls compared to those who did not (Lievesley et al., 2023). The only sound conclusion is to "strongly caution against the use of paedobots as putative 'treatment'" (Cox-George & Bewley, 2018, 2; see also Rutkin, 2016; Strikwerda, 2017). The use of sex dolls and sex robots to allegedly 'treat' child sex offenders might only fuel their desire to continue abusing children (e.g., Malamuth, 2018). It would likely have a "reinforcing effect," as one authority at the John Hopkins School of Medicine said,<sup>75</sup> causing pedophilic desires and thoughts "to be acted upon with greater urgency."

---

<sup>72</sup>Stated in "[Can child dolls keep pedophiles from offending?](#)," *The Atlantic*, 11 January 2016.

<sup>73</sup> "[Man who tried to import childlike sex doll to UK is jailed](#)," 23 June 2017, *The Guardian*.

<sup>74</sup> That term is ill-advised. As per Richardson (2022), it normalizes the idea that ordinary adult sexuality should include children as a legitimate option for attraction.

<sup>75</sup>Stated in "[Can child dolls keep pedophiles from offending?](#)," *The Atlantic*, 11 January 2016.

What about virtual child pornography? Could those images satiate pedophiles? Here, too, there is scant supporting evidence. These images do “not prevent pedophilic individuals from future offending and can instead act as a progressive addiction” (Christensen, Moritz, & Pearson, 2021, 1360). For example, 58% of the men surveyed in a Dark Web forum devoted to trading photos and videos of real child abuse “described feeling afraid that viewing CSAM [child sexual abuse material] might lead to sexual acts with a child or adult” (Insoll et al., 2022, 2). More shocking was that half “reported that they had sought direct contact with children through online platforms after viewing CSAM.” For them, images of real child pornography were not enough. They still tried to abuse real children.

Another study looked at the outcome of “exposure to virtual child pornography, in the form of barely legal sexually explicit depictions” (Paul & Linz, 2008, 35). This is one of the most popular genres on major pornography sites, and mirrors the kinds of images that AI-generating websites create. Exposure to depictions of “underage-looking” women in pornographic scenes, the study concluded, results “in viewers being more likely to associate sex and sexuality to subsequent nonsexual depictions of minors.” Here, again, we see evidence that AI child pornography will reinforce rather than stem a pedophile’s desire to abuse children – and also encourage non-pedophilic men to view girls as sexual objects.

Another study found that many incarcerated sexual offenders were not only themselves sexually victimized, but that “porn was a part of their own sexual abuse” (Osuna & Holt, 2024, 1021-22). These offenders “were concerned that should they have access upon release, porn would affect their decision making and allow for future offending...that the messages inherent in porn could facilitate offending.”

In 2024, a registered sexual predator was arrested in Florida for the possession of fake AI child porn. The images were cartoonish, so he was released, but not before saying that he was unsure how long the fakes would “help him cope with his sexual issues...before his desires got stronger.”<sup>76</sup> Detectives returned a few weeks later and discovered real child abuse images. In Wisconsin, a man who created cartoonish and realistic AI child porn also owned “a manual on how to have safe sex with infants” – as if such a thing were possible.<sup>77</sup> He also had searched online for child sex dolls.

A recent investigation compared the views of male sexual offenders, including child molesters, and non-offenders towards sexbots (Zara, Veggi, & Farrington, 2022). The offenders were “less likely” to believe that the therapeutic use of sexbots could reduce the risk of sexual violence against children and adults.<sup>78</sup> Another study found that incarcerated child sex offenders worried about the impact on their abusive compulsions if they had access to any type of pornography after their release (Holt et al., 2021). We know, moreover, that pornography is a “significant” factor in recidivism of child molesters (Kingston et al., 2008).

---

<sup>76</sup>“[AI-generated child pornography found in possession of Lake City man sparks investigation that leads to arrest](#),” News4Jax, 4 January 2024.

<sup>77</sup>“[Fond du Lac County man faces charges over AI-generated child pornography](#),” Fox 11 News, 14 November 2024.

<sup>78</sup> Men with sexual interest in minors and “non-consent” have a greater interest in sex robots than the wider population (Marečková et al., 2022) – albeit not, I suggest, for therapeutic purposes.



Viewing child sexual abuse, too, is “significantly associated” with early exposure to adult pornography (Napier et al., 2024).

Perhaps apologists should search the term “sex doll” on XVideos, the most popular porn site today after Pornhub.<sup>79</sup> They would see videos of men filming themselves as they sexually penetrated dolls that look like children, videos with names like “super young and cute” and “let’s play sadism” (see also Smith, 2013, 242-43). Apologists, too, could listen to the man in an online sex doll forum who bemoaned the high cost of the dolls. He “would instead ‘do Bangkok’” (Middleweek, 2021, 380). That comment “inspired collective reminiscing among [forum] members of the ‘pleasure’ of ‘Thai girls.’” The author of that article neglected to add that many of those ‘girls’ are, in fact, girls. They are children.

## Sex Dolls and the Law

In general, most countries that allow the viewing of pornography also permit the sale, purchase, and ownership of adult sex dolls. Many of these countries criminalize child sex dolls, however. The devices are illegal in Canada, for example, as a type of “visual representation” of child pornography.<sup>80</sup> In Australia, a 2019 amendment made it a criminal offense to possess a doll or torso that resembles “a person who is, or appears to be, under 18 years of age” if “a reasonable person” would consider it likely that the doll is intended to “simulate” sexual activity.<sup>81</sup> These dolls are also banned in Germany and Denmark (see Desbuleux & Fuss, 2024b; Loibl et al., 2023). In the UK, possession is not illegal except when the doll is ‘obscene’ and there is intent to distribute, sell, or send the doll in the post.<sup>82</sup> On two occasions in 2017 and 2024, men in the UK were arrested for trying to bring a child sex doll into the country. They were also both found to possess images of real child abuse.<sup>83</sup> Here, again, we see that sex dolls which resemble minors do not protect children.

A good number of sex doll retailers discuss the legality of child dolls. Petite Sex Doll, for example, [advises](#) that some countries ban them, and a few others “have height guidance on dolls with small breasts, which often means no mini-dolls allowed unless they have huge boobs and big curvy hips.” YourDoll also has a lengthy [discussion](#) of global laws. (I would not recommend seeking legal guidance from either site.) In the vast majority of countries, the purchase of a sex doll to simulate the rape of a child is as lawful as an online visit to Pornhub.

In the US, again, the legality of these objects currently rests with the states. They have recently been made illegal in South Dakota, Wisconsin, Arizona, and more, and many states have bills pending or in progress. At the federal level, legislation to ban child sex robots, called the CREEPER Act (Curbing Realistic Exploitative Electronics Pedophilic Robots), passed the House of Representatives in 2018 but not the Senate. Subsequent legislation has also failed,

---

<sup>79</sup>As per the web traffic data posted to [Similarweb](#).

<sup>80</sup> [R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46, 163.1](#). See also “[Child sex doll seized at the border: Digby man facing child pornography charges](#),” Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 29 October 2024. 3

<sup>81</sup> “[Combatting Child Sexual Exploitation Legislation Amendment Act 2019 \(No. 72, 2019\)](#).”

<sup>82</sup>“[Sex Dolls – Childlike](#),” Crown Prosecution Service, 9 September 2022.

<sup>83</sup> “[UK man who imported ‘childlike sex doll’ given suspended jail term](#),” The Guardian, 29 September 2017; “[Man tried to import child sex doll after arrest](#),” BBC, 9 October 2024.

mainly due to vague language and an inability to accept the notion that these dolls are “intrinsically” linked to real child abuse (Marchant & Climbingbear, 2022, 97-98, who do not endorse the legislation).<sup>84</sup>

A new act, CREEPER 2.0 was introduced in the 118th Congress.<sup>85</sup> It aimed to ban the sale, purchase, delivery, distribution, and possession of child rape dolls. It died at the end of the term in 2024 without any votes.<sup>86</sup>

## Teledildonics

AI makes it possible for couples, strangers, and groups to interact in simultaneous sexual activity across distances. The same technology allows individuals by themselves to ‘feel’ as if they are sexually engaged with pornographic fantasies projected in their virtual reality or VR headsets. This occurs through Bluetooth-enabled sex toys, called teledildonics or cyberdildonics.

These devices use Bluetooth technology to wirelessly connect to a laptop, desktop, smart phone, smart television, gaming console, and the like, itself connected to the internet. The device is then literally inserted into, or slipped over, the user’s genitals. A partner somewhere else - even in another country - does the same with their setup. An app or downloadable program, which also allows the users to see each other through their webcams, then syncs the devices so they vibrate, pulse, and gyrate in tandem. This way, two people can engage in simultaneous virtual sex.

Alternatively, one can sync their sexual device to a pornographic video made for VR headsets or to an AI ‘virtual girlfriend’ (again as discussed in the previous CR report, mentioned above). This allows the user to feel as if he – they are mainly men – is having sex with his fantasy. It is important to realize that some, if not many, virtual girlfriends resemble minors or dress like them. Some of the ready-made VR girlfriends available for ‘purchase’ from [Lovescape](#) and [Myloves.ai](#) include Tina (“She’s your sister, always supportive”), Alice (“Your girlfriend’s daughter”), and Kelly (“desperate runaway”). None of these VR girlfriends look over 18. By syncing a teledildonic device to one of these VR girlfriends, or any of the thousands of others who resemble them, VR pornography can reasonably be said to encourage men to view unlawful sexuality as desirable and normative.

One teledildonic device was announced to work with ChatGPT, the online ‘chatbot’.<sup>87</sup> It would stimulate the user according to an AI-composed erotic story based on his sexual tastes.<sup>88</sup> A paper in a medical journal (Smerina & Pearlman, 2025) ignored the possibility that this kind of technology could enhance the realism for sexual violence and so encourage men to act that way towards women and girls.

---

<sup>84</sup> Science-based legislation, I note, would not bar age-appropriate sex education tools in the classroom or the use of anatomical dolls in diagnosing sexual abuse in children.

<sup>85</sup> H.R. 2877, CREEPER Act 2.0, [Curbing Realistic Exploitative Electronic Pedophilic Robots Act 2.0](#).

<sup>86</sup> “[Sex robots go to court: Testing the limits of privacy and sexual freedom](#),” The Hill, 27 January 2024.

<sup>87</sup> ChatGPT is owned by the for-profit company, OpenAI. Microsoft is the largest shareholder.

<sup>88</sup> “[This sex toy company uses ChatGPT to whisper sweet, customizable fantasies at you](#),” Tech Crunch, 5 July 2023.

Some of the better-known companies that manufacture teledildonic genital gadgets include Lovense, Kiroo, Bellesa, Satisfyer, OhMiBod, LoveHoney, Motorbunny, Lioness, and We-Vibe. The devices come in a bewildering variety of shapes, sizes, and colors.<sup>89</sup> Some devices come with proprietary software. There are also programs that work with many different devices, such as [FeelMe AI](#), downloadable from both Google Play and the Apple App store. It is compatible with devices that have names like PowerBlow and Handy. One can also download open-source programs, such as [Buttplug](#). These devices are typically promoted as facilitating intimacy during long-distance separations.<sup>90</sup> There is considerable discussion about the use of these devices for disabled persons (Egwatu, et al., 2019; Corti et al., 2023) and treating sexual impairments (Lafortune et al., 2021; Varod & Heruti, 2023). Despite good intentions, however, these functions are overplayed. The market for teledildonics is not driven by mental health or disability advocates, but by pornography. No better evidence for this is the fact that the CamSoda sex webcamming platform has released [OhRoma](#), a mask attached to a VR headset that syncs with a teledildonics device. The user inserts scented cartridges in the mask to release smells – say, panties private parts – at appropriate scenes in the video. That would seem to have little therapeutic efficacy.

Equally silly is the marketing of the sex toy called the [Lovelife Krush](#) made by OhMiBod – two insertable “pleasure” balls encased in plastic – as a “smart Kegel Exerciser.” Even some academics promote this foolishness (e.g., Nixon 2017, 206). But, like sex robots and sex dolls, academics tend to respond to teledildonics with glee (e.g., Power et al., 2024). They again make much about the deconstruction of normative definition of sexuality. But, as with all forms of AI pornography, these breathless assertions clash with reality.

Most sex toys are modelled after heterosexual intercourse (Faustino, 2018). They reproduce cultural stereotypes of male and female. Manufacturers and retailers of these devices are driven by revenues, not egalitarian politics. Just as pornography teaches boys and men to interact with all women and girls as objects for their own sexual pleasure, AI sex toys now make it possible to think of anything with a microchip as a potential sexual device (Liberati, 2020). This does not liberate sexuality from repressive constraints but engulfs the world in the outlook of Pornhub.

There are many privacy risks with AI sex devices. They collect data on the user’s most intimate activities for commercial profits (Wilson-Barnao & Collie, 2018). Both Lovense and WeVibe have been the subjects of class action lawsuits for collecting unauthorized personal data.<sup>91</sup> Some of these devices are hackable.<sup>92</sup> Someone other than the intended partner could therefore control a VR sex toy, or feign a false online identity, in order to have virtual sex with an unwitting partner, or coerce the person into, say, touching herself before a webcam (Sparrow & Karas, 2020; Gidaris, 2023; Harduf, 2021).

---

<sup>89</sup>They are especially common among female performers on sexual webcamming platforms; see the Culture Reframed report, “[OnlyFans Is Only Porn: The Online Ecosystem of Webcamming and OnlyFans](#).”

<sup>90</sup>There is also the [Kissenger](#), “World’s first mobile kiss messenger.”

<sup>91</sup> “[Vibrator maker to pay millions over claims it secretly tracked use](#),” National Public Radio, 14 March 2017;

“[Net-connected vibrator collects users’ intimate data, lawsuit claims](#),” NBC News, 1 February 2018.

<sup>92</sup>“[Sex toy company admits to recording users’ remote sex sessions, calls it a ‘minor bug’](#),” The Verge, 10 November 2017.

The industry has created virtual reality locations and rooms where users, equipped with teledildonic devices and VR goggles, can visit to meet others in the guise of their personalized characters or avatars. For example, [ViRo Playspace](#) advertises as “the world’s first haptic driven virtual social space where touch is encouraged.” The system works with a wide range of devices, such as the Youcups Warrior 2, Vibratissimo, and Pornhub Blowjobbot, as well as Xbox Gamepads. You can frolic with a Siberian vampire, a “smokin’ hot dragon babe” (“puts the ‘lay’ in ‘dragonslayer’”), and Doggy Girl.

Under development by [Orifice](#) is “the first robotic vagina – powered by AI.” The device syncs with VR and can also connect to “favorite OnlyFans personalities.” The company “provides unique realistic adult experiences, personalized intimacy and a level of affection that NO ‘Modern Woman’ is capable of.” Its motto is, “AI women are women.”

By any standard, some of these devices are bizarre. One quasi-scholarly paper, referring to the [‘Siime](#),’ a combination Wi-Fi camera and vibrator, spoke of the “tantalising possibility of being able to watch yourself from the inside as you masturbate and climax” (Nixon, 2017, 205). You could also “send the pictures to whomever you wish, adding yet another layer of digitized possibility to the concept of voyeurism.”

The teledildonic and related industries are unregulated. Many sex toys are made from toxic substances (Sipe et al., 2023). No regulations prevent companies from using data to formulate unscientific generalizations about the intimate habits of people based on their race, gender, sexual orientation, and other demographic characteristics, which may reproduce false and harmful stereotypes (Lee et al., 2023).

Most scholars who raise concerns about these devices do so in the service of the pornography industry (e.g., Stardust, 2024; Pym et al., 2023; Döring et al., 2022). They rarely consider how these gadgets perpetuate sexual violence by harnessing AI to make pornography seem ever more arousing and compelling. Since some teledildonic devices, as noted above, can be controlled by open-source software, they could easily be synced to videos that show men assaulting, abusing, insulting, spitting on, slapping, kicking, pushing, and raping women, as well as engaging in child sexual abuse (Arrell, 2022, 596). Some of the victims, moreover, could be known to the user, such as an ex-lover. These devices further enmesh human sexuality in corporate greed and pornographic exploitation.

## Conclusion

Throughout this report, I have shown that artificial intelligence is now an important and growing crucial enhancement of pornographic representations of children. In each instance, these devices and images were seen to pose real and compelling dangers to the social, emotional, and physical development of young people and also of adults who consume these representations. But no matter how well documented these harms, too many members of the academy remain beholden to the predatory pornography industry and its reigning ideologies of misogyny and sexual violence.

Robots and AI programs send a message to children and adults alike about what men should expect sexually from women and girls – and what women and girls should heed: that the true worth of a woman is her fidelity to Pornhub, Hooters, or worse. One male sex doll owner said, “It’s a bit of like being your own God” (Yalcinkaya et al., 2023, 201). We do not want AI in the hands of men, raised on porn, who feel like a god.



## References

*Note: This Reference section includes books, scholarly articles, and major magazine articles. Citations to news media, laws, press releases, and the like are found in the footnotes.*

- Andreallo, F. (2022). Human–robot companionship: Cultural ideas, limitations, and aspirations. An analysis of sex robot marketing videos. *International Journal of Social Robotics* 14, 2109–2122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-022-00865-2>
- Aoki, B.Y., & Kimura, T. (2021). Sexuality and affection in the time of technological innovation: Artificial partners in the Japanese context. *Religions* 12, Article 296. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12050296>
- Arrell, R. (2022). Sex and emergent technologies. In B.D. Earp, C. Chambers, & L. Watson (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of philosophy of sex and sexuality* (586–600). New York: Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003286523-49/sex-emergent-technologies-robbie-arrell>
- Atanasoski, N., & Vora, K. (2020). Why the sex robot becomes the killer robot. *Reproduction, care, and the limits of refusal*. *Spheres*, 6, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.25969/mediarep/13850>
- Balistreri, M. (2022). *Sex robots: Love in the age of machines*. Trivent.
- Bates, L. (2017). The trouble with sex robots. *The New York Times*, 17 July, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/17/opinion/sex-robots-consent.html>
- Bates, L. (2020). *Men who hate women: From incels to pickup artists: The truth about extreme misogyny and how it affects us all*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Behrendt, M. (2018). Reflections on moral challenges posed by a therapeutic childlike sexbot. In A. D. Cheek and D. Levy (Eds.), *Love and sex with robots*. Third International Conference, LSR 2017, London, UK, December 19–20, 2017, Revised Selected Papers. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76369-9\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76369-9_8)
- Belk, R. 2022. Artificial emotions and love and sex doll service workers. *Journal of Service Research*, 25(4), 521-536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10946705211063692>
- Bernstein, D. (2023, August 22). Could AI-Generated porn help protect children? *Wired*, <https://www.wired.com/story/artificial-intelligence-csam-pedophilia/>
- Björkas, R., & Larsson, M. (2021). Sex dolls in the Swedish media discourse: Intimacy, sexuality, and technology. *Sexuality & Culture*, 25, 1227-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-021-09829-6>
- Brandon, M., & Planke, J. A. (2021). Emotional, sexual and behavioral correlates of attitudes toward sex robots: Results of an online survey. *Journal of Future Robot Life*, 2, 67-82. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FRL-210003>
- Burr-Miller, A., & Aoki, E. (2013). Becoming (hetero) sexual? The hetero-spectacle of idollators and their real dolls. *Sexuality & Culture*, 17, 384–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-013-9187-0>

- Cassidy, V. 2016. For the love of doll(s): A patriarchal nightmare of cyborg couplings. *English Studies in Canada (ESC)*, 42(1-2), 203-215. <https://doi.org/10.1353/esc.2016.0001>
- Christensen, L. S., Moritz, D., & Pearson, A. (2021). Psychological perspectives of virtual child sexual abuse material. *Sexuality & Culture: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly*, 25(4), 1353–1365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-021-09820-1>
- Ciambrone, D., Phua, V. & Avery, E. N. (2017). Gendered synthetic love: Real dolls and the construction of intimacy. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 43(1), 59-78.
- Corti, E., Parati, I., & Dils, C. (2023). Lovewear: Haptic clothing that allows intimate exploration for movement-impaired people. *Leonardo* 56(2), 139-146. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1162/leon\\_a\\_02340](https://doi.org/10.1162/leon_a_02340)
- Cox-George, C., & Bewley, S. (2018). I, Sex Robot: The health implications of the sex robot industry. *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health*, 44(3), 161–164. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjshr-2017-200012>
- Crist, R. (2017, August 10). Behind the scenes at a sex robot factory. CNET, <https://www.cnet.com/pictures/sex-robots-sexbots-abyss-creations-factory-realdoll-harmony/>
- Danaher, J. (2019a). Building better sex robots: Lessons from feminist pornography. In Y. Zhou & M. H. Fischer (Eds.), *AI love you: Developments in human-robot intimate relationships* (pp. 133–148). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19734-6\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19734-6_7)
- Danaher, J. (2019b). Regulating child sex robots: Restriction or experimentation? *Medical Law Review*, 27(4), 553–575. <https://doi.org/10.1093/medlaw/fwz002>
- Davis, A. P. (2018, May 14-27). Are we ready for robot sex? *New York Magazine*, pp. 26-33. <https://www.thecut.com/2018/05/sex-robots-realbotix.html>
- DeFalco, A. (2023). What do sex robots want? Representation, materiality, and queer use. *Configurations*, 31(3), 257-284. <https://doi.org/10.1353/con.2023.a904490>
- Delicado-Moratalla, L. (2022). Mapping the uses of ‘sex’ dolls: Pornographic content, doll brothels and the similarities with rape. In K. Richardson and C. Odland (Eds.), *Man-made women: The sexual politics of sex dolls and sex robots* ( pp. 35-48), Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19381-1\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19381-1_3)
- DeMaris, A., & McGovern, V. (2023). The perfect paramour: Predicting intention to own a sex doll. *Sexuality & Culture*, 27, 674–692. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-10034-2>
- Desbuleux, J. C., & Fuss, J. (2023). Is the anthropomorphization of sex dolls associated with objectification and hostility toward women? A mixed method study among doll users. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 60:2, 206-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2022.2103071>
- Desbuleux, J. C., & Fuss, J. (2024a). The self-reported sexual real-world consequences of sex doll use. *Journal of Sex Research*, 61(8), 1261–1275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2023.2199727>
- Desbuleux, J.C., & Fuss, J. (2024b). Child-like sex dolls: Legal, empirical, and ethical perspectives. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 36, 722-727. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41443-024-00979-3>
- Devlin, K. (2018). *Turned on: Science, sex and robots*. Bloomsbury.
- Devlin, K. (2020). The ethics of the artificial lover. In S. M. Liao (Ed.), *Ethics of artificial intelligence* (pp. 271-290). Oxford University Press; Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190905033.001.0001>

- Devlin, K., & Locatelli, C. (2020). Guys and dolls: Sex robot creators and consumers. In O. Bendel (Ed.), *Maschinenliebe: Liebespuppen und sexroboter aus technischer, psychologischer und philosophischer perspektive* (pp. 79-92). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-29864-7\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-29864-7_5)
- Dewitte, M., & Reisman, Y. (2021). Clinical use and implications of sexual devices and sexually explicit media. *Nature Reviews Urology*, 18, 359–377. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41585-021-00456-2>
- Dines, G., & Sanchez, M. (2023). Hentai and the pornification of childhood: How the porn industry just made the case for regulation. *Dignity: A Journal of Analysis of Exploitation and Violence*, 8(1), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.23860/dignity.2023.08.01.03>
- DiTecco, D., & Karaian, L. (2023). New technology, same old stigma: Media narratives of sex robots and sex work. *Sexuality & Culture*, 27, 539-569. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-10027-1>
- Döring, N., Mikhailova, V., & Noorishad, P.-G. (2022). How customers evaluate genitalia versus torso sex toys on amazon.com: A content analysis of product reviews. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 12(6), 563–578. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe12060042>
- Döring, N., Mohseni, M. R., Walter, R. 2020. Design, use, and effects of sex dolls and sex robots: Scoping review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(7), Article e18551. <https://doi.org/10.2196/18551>
- Dubé, S., & Anctil, D. (2021). Foundations of Erotics. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 13, 1205-1233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-020-00706-0>
- Dudek, S. Y., & Young, J. E. (2022). Fluid sex robots: Looking to the 2LGBTQIA+ community to shape the future of sex robots, 2022 17th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI), Sapporo, Japan, 2022, pp. 746-749, <https://doi.org/10.1109/HRI53351.2022.988958>
- Eelmaa, S. (2022). Sexualization of children in deepfakes and hentai: Examining Reddit user views. *Trames*, 26(2), 229-248. <https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2022.2.07>
- Egwatu, C., Sawyer, B.D., & Hancock, P.A. (2019). Perspectives: Digital influences on sexual discourse in disabled populations. *Critical Disability Discourses*, 9, <https://cdd.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cdd/article/view/39748>
- Ehrenkranz, M. (2016, December 18). What our violent obsession with sex robots reveals about us. MIC, <https://www.mic.com/articles/162206/westworld-rape-violence-abuse-sexism-sex-robots-consent-what-it-says-about-us>
- Eskens, R. 2017. Is sex with robots rape? *Journal of Practical Ethics*, 5(2), 62-76. <https://www.jpe.ox.ac.uk/papers/is-sex-with-robots-rape/>
- Fan, R., & Cherry, M. J. (Eds.) (2021). *Sex robots: Social impact and the future of human relations*. Springer. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-82280-4>
- Faustino, Maria João. (2018). Rebooting an old script by new means: Teledildonics—The technological return to the ‘coital imperative.’ *Sexuality & Culture*, 22, 243-257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-017-9463-5>
- Fosch-Villaronga, E. & Poulsen, A. (2020). Sex care robots: Exploring the potential use of sexual robot technologies for disabled and elder care. *Paladyn*, 11(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pjbr-2020-0001>

- Foundation for Responsible Robotics. (2017). Our sexual future with robots: A Foundation for Responsible Robotics consultation report. Available at [https://web.archive.org/web/20170709002722/https://responsiblerobotics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/FRR-Consultation-Report-Our-Sexual-Future-with-robots\\_Final.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20170709002722/https://responsiblerobotics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/FRR-Consultation-Report-Our-Sexual-Future-with-robots_Final.pdf)
- Frank, L., & Nyholm, S. (2017). Robot sex and consent: Is consent to sex between a robot and a human conceivable, possible, and desirable? *Artificial Intelligence & Law*, 25, 305–323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-017-9212-y>
- Gatzia, D. E., & Arnaud, S. (2022). Loving objects: Can autism explain objectophilia? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 51(4), 2117–2133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02281-5>
- Giard, A. (2017). Duplicates of minors sold as “Love Dolls”: Disturbance in sexual representation. *Hybrid*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.4000/hybrid.823>
- Gidaris, C. (2023). The problem of consent with teledildonics and adult webcam platforms. *Surveillance & Society*, 22(1), 6–17. <https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v22i1.15720>
- González-González, C.S., Gil-Iranzo, R.M., Paderewski-Rodríguez, P. (2021). Human–robot interaction and sexbots: A systematic literature review. *Sensors*, 21, Article 216, <https://doi.org/10.3390/s21010216>
- Gutiu, S. M. (2016). The roboticization of consent. In R. Calo, A. M. Froomkin, & I. Kerr (Eds.), *Robot Law* (pp. 186–212), Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783476732.00016>
- Hancock, E. (2020). Should society accept sex robots?: Changing my perspective on sex robots through researching the future of intimacy. *Paladyn*, 11(1), 428–442. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pjbr-2020-0025>
- Hanson, K. R. (2021). The silicone self: Examining sexual selfhood and stigma within the love and sex doll community. *Symbolic Interaction*, 45(2), 189–210. <https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.575>
- Hanson, K. R. (2023). What does the personification of love and sex dolls explain about doll owners? *Deviant Behavior*, 44:6, 823–840. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2022.2105669>
- Hanson, K.R., & Locatelli, C.C. (2022). From sex dolls to sex robots and beyond: A narrative review of theoretical and empirical research on human-like and personified sex tech. *Current Sexual Health Reports*, 14, 106–117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-022-00331-0>
- Harduf, A. (2021). Rape goes cyber: Online violations of sexual autonomy. *University of Baltimore Law Review*, 50(3), Article 2. <https://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ublr/vol50/iss3/2>
- Harper, C. A., & Lievesley, R. (2022). Exploring the ownership of child-like sex dolls. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 51, 4141–4156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-022-02422-4>
- Harper, C. A., Lievesley, R., & Wanless, K. (2023). Exploring the psychological characteristics and risk-related cognitions of individuals who own sex dolls. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 60:2, 190–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2022.2031848>
- Holt, K., Kissinger, J., Spickler, C., & Roush, V. (2024). Pornography use and sexual offending: An examination of perceptions of role and risk. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 68(6-7), 613–637. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X211049183>
- Illes, J., & Udwardia, F. R. (2019, August 27). Sex robots increase the potential for gender-based violence. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/sex-robots-increase-the-potential-for-gender-based-violence-122361>

- Insoll, T., Ovaska, A. K., Nurmi, J., Aaltonen, M., & Vaaranen-Valkonen, N. (2022). Risk factors for child sexual abuse material users contacting children online: Results of an anonymous multilingual survey on the dark web. *Journal of Online Trust and Safety*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.54501/jots.v1i2.29>
- Jecker, N. S. (2021). Nothing to be ashamed of: Sex robots for older adults with disabilities. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 47, 26-32. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2020-106645>
- Jecker, N. S. (2023). Can we wrong a robot? *AI & Society*, 38, 259–268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01278-x>
- Johnson, D.G., & Verdicchio, M. (2020). Constructing the meaning of humanoid sex robots. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 12, 415–424. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-019-00586-z>
- Karaian, L. (2024). Plastic fantastic: Sex robots and/as sexual fantasy. *Sexualities*, 27(3), 633-652. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13634607221106667>
- Kaufman, Ellen M. (2020). Reprogramming consent: Implications of sexual relationships with artificially intelligent partners, *Psychology & Sexuality*, 11:4, 372-383. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2020.1769160>
- Kingston, D. A., Fedoroff, P., Firestone, P., Curry, S., & Bradford, J. M. (2008). Pornography use and sexual aggression: The impact of frequency and type of pornography use on recidivism among sexual offenders. *Aggressive Behavior*, 34(4), 341–351. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20250>
- Kinsella, S. (2000). *Adult manga: Culture and power in contemporary Japanese society*. Routledge.
- Kleeman, J. (2020). *Sex robots and vegan meat: Adventures at the frontier of birth, food, sex, and death*. Picador.
- Klein, W. E. J., & Lin, V. W. (2018) ‘Sex robots’ revisited: A reply to the campaign against sex robots. *ACM SIGCAS Computers and Society*, 47(4): 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3243141.3243153>
- Knafo, D., & Lo Bosco, R. (2017). *The age of perversion: Desire and technology in psychoanalysis and culture*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kubes, Tanja (2019), New materialist perspectives on sex robots. A feminist dystopia/utopia? *Social Sciences*, 8 (8), Article 224. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8080224>
- Lafortune, D, Dion, L., & Renaud, P. (2020). Virtual reality and sex therapy: Future directions for clinical research. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 46:1, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2019.1623357>
- Lancaster, K. (2021). Non-consensual personified sexbots: An intrinsic wrong. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 23, 589–600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-021-09597-9>
- Lane, M. (1999, June 15). Real doll. *Monk Magazine*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20220122013324/https://www.monk.com/display.php?p=People&id=38>
- Langcaster-James, M., & Bentley, G. R. (2018). Beyond the sex doll: Post-human companionship and the rise of the ‘Allodoll’. *Robotics*, 7(4), Article 62. <https://doi.org/10.3390/robotics7040062>
- Lee, H.-P., Yang, Y.-J., von Davier, T. S., Forlizzi, J., & Das, S. (2023). Deepfakes, phrenology, surveillance, and more! A taxonomy of AI privacy risks. *arXiv:2310.07879 [cs.HC]*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.07879>



- Levy, D. (2009). *Love and sex with robots: The evolution of human-robot relationships*. Harper Collins.
- Levy, N. (2002). Virtual child pornography: The eroticization of inequality. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 4, 319–323. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021372601566>
- Liberati, N. (2020). Making out with the world and valuing relationships with humans. *Paladyn*, 11(1), 140–146. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pjbr-2020-0010>
- Lievesley, R., Harper, C. A., Woodward, E., & Tenbergen, G. (2023). Fantasy sexual material use by people with attractions to children. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 25(9), 395–404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-023-01435-7>
- Lievesley, R., Reynolds, R. & Harper, C. (2023). The ‘perfect’ partner: Understanding the lived experiences of men who own sex dolls. *Sexuality & Culture*, 27, 1419–1441. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-023-10071-5>
- Lively, G. (2019). Beyond the beautiful evil? The ancient/future history of sex robots. In J. M. Chesi & F. Spiegel (Eds.), *Classical literature and posthumanism* (pp. 323–330). Bloomsbury.
- Locatelli, C. (2022). Rewiring the ‘sex robot’: Gender, desire and embodiment in posthuman sextech. *Journal of Digital Social Research*, 4 (3), 10–33. <https://doi.org/10.33621/jdsr.v4i3.87>
- Loibl, E., van der Aa, S., Hendriks-Lundh, M., & Niemark, R. (2023). Exploring different national approaches to prohibiting childlike sex dolls. *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, 30(1), 63–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1023263X231176908>
- Malamuth, N. M. (2018). “Adding fuel to the fire”? Does exposure to non-consenting adult or to child pornography increase risk of sexual aggression? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 41, 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.02.013>
- Maras, M., & Shapiro, L. (2017) Child sex dolls and robots: More than just an uncanny valley. *Journal of Internet Law*, 21(5), 3–21. <https://ccybers.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Child-Sex-Dolls-and-Robots-More-Than-Just-an-Uncanny-Valley.pdf>
- Marchant, G. E., & Climbingbear, K. (2022). Legal resistance to sex robots. *Journal of Future Robot Life*, 3(1), 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FRL-210009>
- Marečková, A., Androvičová, R., Bártová, K., Krejčová, L., & Kateřina, K. (2022). Men with paraphilic interests and their desire to interact with a sex robot. *Journal of Future Robot Life*, 3(1), 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FRL-210010>
- Massa, N., Bisconti, P. & Nardi, D. (2022). The psychological implications of companion robots: A theoretical framework and an experimental setup. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 15, 2101–2114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-021-00846-x>
- Merdian, H. L., Wefers, S., Bradshaw, H., & Perkins, D. (2022). Non-photographic images of child sexual abuse: The risks and public policy responses. Project Report. British Board of Film Classification.
- Middleweek, B. (2021). Male homosocial bonds and perceptions of human–robot relationships in an online sex doll forum. *Sexualities*, 24(3), 370–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460720932383>
- Napier, S. S., Seto, M. C., Cashmore, J., & Shackel, R. (2024). Characteristics that predict exposure to and subsequent intentional viewing of child sexual abuse material among a community sample of

- Internet users. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 156, Article 106977.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2024.106977>
- Nazlıpınar Subaşı, M. D. (2023). A new era of fetishism: Winterson's *Dys/utopian* sexbots. *Söylem Filoloji Dergisi*, 8(2), 421-432. <https://doi.org/10.29110/soylemdergi.1293662>
- Nixon, P. G. (2017). Hell yes!!!!: Playing away, teledildonics and the future of sex. In P. G. Nixon & I. K. Düsterhöft's (Eds.), *Sex in the Digital Age* (pp. 201-211). Routledge.  
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315446240-19/hell-yes-paul-nixon>
- Nyholm, S. (2022). The ethics of humanoid sex robots. In L. Watson, C. Chambers, B.D. Earp (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of philosophy of sex and sexuality* (pp. 574-585). Routledge.  
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003286523-48/ethics-humanoid-sex-robot-s-sven-nyholm>
- Oravec, J. A. (2022). Love, sex, and robots: Technological shaping of intimate relationships. In *Good robot, bad robot: Dark and creepy sides of robotics, autonomous vehicles, and AI: Social and cultural studies of robots and AI* (pp. 91-123). Palgrave Macmillan.  
[https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-14013-6\\_4](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-14013-6_4)
- Osuna, A. I., & Holt, K. (2024). Pornography use and sexual scripts among men who have committed sexual offenses. *Crime & Delinquency*, 70(3), 1005-1033. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00111287221115647>
- Pasciuto, F., Cava, A., & Falzone, A. (2023). The potential use of sex robots in adults with autistic spectrum disorders: A theoretical framework. *Brain Sciences*, 13, Article 954.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci13060954>
- Paul, B., & Linz, D. G. (2008). The effects of exposure to virtual child pornography on viewer cognitions and attitudes toward deviant sexual behavior. *Communication Research*, 35(1), 3-38.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650207309359>
- Peeters, A., & Haselager, P. (2021). Designing virtuous sex robots. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 13, 55-66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-019-00592-1>
- Peschka, L., & Raab, M. (2022). A thing like a human? A mixed-methods study on sex doll usage. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 34(4), 728-746.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2022.2128491>
- Power, J. (2020) My queer love bot. In J. Power, H. von Doussa, & T.W. Jones, (Eds.) *Bent Street 4.1: Love from a distance*. Clouds of Magellan.
- Power, J., Pym, T., James, A., & Waling, A. (2024). Smart sex toys: A narrative review of recent research on cultural, health and safety considerations. *Current Sexual Health Reports*, 16, 199-215.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-024-00392-3>
- Pym, T., James, A., Waling, A., Power, J., & Dowsett, G. W. (2023). 'Synced as a couple': Responsibility, control and connection in accounts of using wireless sex devices during heterosex. *Sexualities*, 0(0), pp. 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13634607231218832>
- Ray, P. (2016). 'Synthetik love lasts forever': Sex dolls and the (post?) human condition. In D. Banerji & M. R. Paranjape (Eds.), *Critical posthumanism and planetary futures* (pp. 91-112). Springer India.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-3637-5\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-3637-5_6)

- Reeves, C. (2018). The virtual simulation of child sexual abuse: Online gameworld users' views, understanding and responses to sexual ageplay. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 20(2), 101-113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-018-9449-5>
- Richardson, K. (2015). The asymmetrical 'relationship': Parallels between prostitution and the development of sex robots. *ACM SIGCAS Computers and Society*, 45(3), 290-293. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2874239.2874281>
- Richardson, K. (2016, June). Sex robot matters: Slavery, the prostituted, and the rights of machines. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 46-53. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MTS.2016.2554421>
- Richardson, K. (2022). The end of sex robots: Porn robots and representational technologies of women and girls. In: K. Richardson, & C.Odlind. (Eds.) *Man-made women. Social and cultural studies of robots and AI* (pp.171-192). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19381-1\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19381-1_9)
- Rigotti, C. (2020). Sex robots through feminist lenses. *Filosofia*, (65), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.13135/2704-8195/5076>
- Robertson, J. (2010). Gendering humanoid robots: Robo-sexism in Japan. *Body & Society*, 16(2), 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1357034X10364767>
- Roper, C. (2022). Sex dolls, robots and woman hating: The case for resistance. *Spinifex*.
- Ruberg, B. (2022). *Sex dolls at sea: Imagined histories of sexual technologies*. MIT Press.
- Rutkin, A. (2016, August 2). Could sex robots and virtual reality treat paedophilia? *New Scientist*, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2099607-could-sex-robots-and-virtual-reality-treat-paedophilia/>
- Schussler, A.E. (2020). Artificially intelligent sexbots and sexual solipsism: Posthumanist ethical approach. *Journal of Posthuman Studies*, 4(1), 25-40. <https://doi.org/10.5325/jpoststud.4.1.0025>
- Simner, J., Hughes, J.E.A. & Sagiv, N. (2019). Objectum sexuality: A sexual orientation linked with autism and synaesthesia. *Scientific Reports*, 9, Article 19874. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-56449-0>
- Sinclair, D., Dowdeswell, T., & (Sean) Goltz, N. (2022). Artificially intelligent sex bots and female slavery: Social science and Jewish legal and ethical perspectives. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 32(3), 328–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2022.2154050>
- Sipe, J.M., Amos, J.D., Swarthout, R.F., Turner, A., Wiesner, M. R., & Ogilvie Hender, C. (2023). Bringing sex toys out of the dark: Exploring unmitigated risks. *Microplastics and Nanoplastics*, 3, Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43591-023-00054-6>
- Smerina, D. R. & A.M. Perlman. (2025). The intersection of Artificial Intelligence, wearable devices, and sexual medicine. *Current Urology Reports*, 26, Article 14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11934-024-01244-2>
- Smith, M. 2013. *The erotic doll: A modern fetish*. Yale University Press.
- Sparrow, R. (2017). Robots, rape, and representation. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 9, 465–477. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-017-0413-z>
- Sparrow, R. (2021). Sex robot fantasies. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 47(1), 33-34. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2020-106932>

- Sparrow, R., & Karas, L. (2020). Teledildonics and rape by deception. *Law, Innovation and Technology*, 12(1), 174-204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2020.1727097>
- Stardust, Z. (2024). Sex tech in an age of surveillance capitalism: Design, data and governance. In P. Aggleton, R. Cover, C.H. Logie, C.E. Newman, & R. Parker, (Eds.). *Routledge handbook of sexuality, gender, health and rights*. [2nd ed.] (pp. 448-458). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003278405-52/sex-tech-age-surveillance-capitalism-zahra-stardust>
- Strikwerda L. (2017). Legal and moral implications of child sex robots. In: J. Danaher N. McArthur, (Eds.). *Robot sex: Social and ethical implications* (pp 133–52). MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10718.003.0013>
- Su, N. M., Lazar, A., Bardzell, J., & Bardzell, S. (2019). Of dolls and men: Anticipating sexual intimacy with robots. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 26(3), 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3301422>
- Theil, D. 2023. Identifying and eliminating CSAM in generative ML training data and models. *Cyber Policy Center, Stanford Internet Observatory*. <https://doi.org/10.25740/kh752sm9123>
- Tonna-Barthet, C. (2018). The harmful effects of sex robots. *Trinity Women's Review*, 2(1), 23-32. <https://ojs.tchpc.tcd.ie/index.php/TrinityWomensReview/article/view/2049>
- Van Grunsven, J. (2022). Anticipating sex robots: A critique of the sociotechnical vanguard vision of sex robots as 'good companions.' In E. Terrone, & V. Tripodi, (Eds.). *Being and value in technology* (pp. 63-91). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88793-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88793-3_4)
- Van Voorst, R. (2022). My adventures with Nick and Hannah: Anthropological explorations into sexdolls and the potential implications for human intimacy. *Journal of Future Robot Life*, 3, 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FRL-210004>
- Varod, S., & Heruti, R. J. (2023). The sextech industry and innovative devices for treating sexual dysfunction. *International Journal of Impotence Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41443-023-00731-3>
- Wilson-Barnao, C., & Collie, N. (2018). The droning of intimacy: Bodies, data, and sensory devices, *Continuum*, 32:6, 733-744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2018.1525922>
- Wolf, M. (2021). Companion sex robots: Racialized household economics. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 37(2), 43-64. <https://doi.org/10.2979/jfemistudreli.37.2.04>
- Wosk, J. (2024). *Artificial women: Sex dolls, robot caregivers, and more facsimile females*. Indian University Press.
- Yalcinkaya, E, Banbury, S., Visick, A., Chandler, C., & Lusher, J. (2023) Men who have sex with robot dolls: A Foucauldian discourse analysis. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 17(3), 195-205. <https://wjarr.com/sites/default/files/WJARR-2023-0362.pdf>
- Yeoman, I., & Mars, M. (2012). Robots, men and sex tourism. *Futures*, 44(4), 365-371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.11.004>
- Zara, G., Veggi, S., & Farrington, D. P. (2022). Sexbots as synthetic companions: Comparing attitudes of official sex offenders and non-offenders. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 14(2), 479–498. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-021-00797-3>

Zhou, Y. (2019). Preventive strategies for pedophilia and the potential role of robots: Open workshop discussion. In Y. Zhou & M. H. Fischer (Eds.), *AI love you: Developments in human-robot intimate relationships* (pp. 169-174). Springer.



This Report was published April 2025, written by Eric Silverman for Culture Reframed.

Contact Us:

Culture Reframed  
P.O. Box 443  
Sterling, MA 01564  
<https://culturereframed.org>  
[info@culturereframed.org](mailto:info@culturereframed.org)

