

# Prostitution policy, morality and the precautionary principle

## Introduction

Though poorly defined, morality policy typically describes any policy field where emotion and ideology rules over rationality and reason. This intrusion of the moral and emotional into decision-making renders notions of evidence-based policy problematic at best, and impossible at worst (Henricson, 2016). Prostitution – alongside issues such as abortion, drugs, pornography, capital punishment, and gambling – is classically cited as an example of morality policy, one in which policy is determined by a sense of what is ultimately *felt* to be right or wrong (Wagenaar and Altink, 2012). In this sense, any attempt to regulate the consumption of sexual services can be read as an attempt to draw boundaries between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ behaviour based on the understanding that the commodification of the sexual relationship is sinful or wrong. This given, ‘expert’ or close knowledge of the sex industry is not necessarily sufficient to displace the deeply-held moral views of politicians, with public opinion believed to be as valid as the views of academics or researchers in this morally-fraught field. From the perspective of the policy-maker, there are no absolute rights and wrongs, just different perspectives on the ethics and morality of selling sex. This means sex work legislation is determined by the beliefs and convictions of politicians and policy-makers, and not evidence per se.

All this is well and good were it not for the fact prostitution policy – like the policies determining the consumption of drugs and alcohol – is frequently presented as something quite different. Indeed, while there have always been moral crusades against prostitution, some of which persist in the contemporary era in the form of evangelical attempts to save sex workers from ‘sin’, governments have generally sought to distance prostitution policy from morality by suggesting that policy is both evidence-based and designed to promote public health and well-being. This means that rights-based arguments (e.g. that a consenting adult has the right to sell sex) are often found wanting in the face of laws which repress prostitution on the stated grounds that this is necessary to protect the worker, the client and the health of the population at large. While rights-based arguments sometimes prevail (e.g. *Bedford v Canada* 2013 SCC 72, where the Supreme Court ruled that Criminal Code provisions criminalizing activities related to prostitution violated rights to free expression and personal security), more generally moralistic and censorious policies masquerading as harm-reduction come to dominate (Lawrence, 2015). Here, the parallels with drugs and alcohol policy are clear, such as in instances where claims about protecting public health and safety have scotched initiatives designed to encourage safe consumption (e.g. drug consumption rooms), despite the benefits these have in terms of harm reduction (Zampini, 2014).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Nonetheless, governments regularly consult on prostitution policy, asking for submissions that demonstrate the impacts of prostitution on workers, clients and the wider community. Our personal experience as participants and expert witnesses in such exercises shows us that academic evidence is *selectively* arrayed to show that sex workers are victimised and exploited, that prostitution harms the well-being of communities, and that it is criminogenic. Policies are hence formulated which, while they typically do not undermine the inherent legality of rights to sell sex, effectively criminalise the selling of sex via laws preventing the opening of brothels, banning street soliciting, or even outlawing the purchase of sex itself.

Of course, there is much national variation here. However, in recent years academic commentators in Europe have noted a slow drift towards a more repressive and punitive policies. As such, in many European nations, a long-standing abolitionist attitude that sex work is undesirable but inevitable has been replaced by a more overtly prohibitionist stance. Indeed, the so-called 'Nordic model' that criminalises the purchase of sex is becoming increasingly influential, with the Northern Ireland Assembly introducing new laws prohibiting the purchase of sex in 2015 and the French National Assembly doing likewise in 2016. Elsewhere, nations that once took a more pragmatic attitude to sex work by decriminalising the sale of sex in particular spaces such as brothels or identified street walking zones (e.g. Austria, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland) have tended towards more intrusive forms of legalisation that effect a tighter control and surveillance of sex workers and their customers (Outshoorn, 2012; Pates, 2012). However, it is not clear that such emergent policy approaches, typically justified as attempts to prevent exploitation and criminality in the sex industry, are achieving their stated aims (Levy and Jakobsson, 2014). Nevertheless, they have considerable symbolic power, buttressing the moral values that define the 'body politic' in a time of concern about permeable national boundaries (Hubbard et al, 2008). In this light, there is now little political support in England and Wales for the total removal of criminal sanctions from commercial sex, with the opposition leader Jeremy Corbyn's support for a New Zealand type repeal of prostitution law having met a stony reaction even from members of his own Labour party.

In this paper we accordingly argue that in spite of the increasing emphasis in policy circles on evidence (and particularly quantitative evidence) (Ritter and Lancaster, 2013), prostitution policy is best understood as morality policy. This is something we explore in the context of prostitution policy in England & Wales, noting that the 'precautionary principle' currently dominates, with the burden of proof that prostitution is *not* always harmful lying with the government, who typically decline to compile evidence to demonstrate this and instead base prostitution policy on moral values and beliefs. Throughout, we use the term 'prostitution' given policy relating to the sale of sex is framed in such terms, despite the fact that 'sex work' is a more encompassing and less stigmatized term preferred by many working in the sex industry in England and Wales. We also approach the topic as academics promoting a harm reduction or minimisation approach to sex work, an approach that owes much to similar perspectives in drugs and alcohol research. As such, we choose here to emphasise the inevitable and even beneficial dimensions of a

1  
2  
3 form of leisure/work sometimes regarded as sinful, but recognise that some  
4 interventions may be necessary to protect those who buy and sell sex, as well  
5 as those who live and work in proximity to spaces of prostitution.  
6  
7

### 8 **Sex work in England & Wales: from abolitionism to prohibitionism**

9

10 The sale of sexual services has never been illegal in England and Wales,  
11 although many related activities – soliciting, brothel-keeping and pimping in  
12 particular – have. The Wolfenden Committee of 1957 famously articulated  
13 what was considered, until fairly recently, to be the logic underpinning this  
14 (Self, 2003). Grounded in liberal philosophy, it emphasized that what  
15 consenting adults did in private was none of the state's concern unless  
16 exploitation was evident: this was the rationale for the *1956 Sexual Offence*  
17 *Act* which consolidated the statute powers relating to brothel-keeping,  
18 procuring, and living off the avails of prostitution. The subsequent *1959 Street*  
19 *Offences Act* aimed to reduce the 'public nuisance' of street prostitution by  
20 introducing fines for soliciting, targeting any woman identified as a 'common  
21 prostitute' loitering or soliciting in public space (Matthews, 2005). Such  
22 policies justified and maintained a gender-asymmetry, whereby heterosexual  
23 prostitution was assumed to be the only form prevalent and it was the woman  
24 who sells sex - rather than her male client - who was the focus of state  
25 attention. Likewise, by confining state intervention to the 'public' aspects of  
26 prostitution, this approach 'delineated a private sphere of non-intervention'  
27 (Hubbard and Scoular, 2009: 150). One consequence of Wolfenden's focus  
28 on street work was then an expansion of off-street working, with the state  
29 effectively turning a blind eye to most forms of private sex work unless there  
30 was suspicion of any coercion.  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 This framework introduced by Wolfenden remained largely unaltered in the  
36 England and Wales for more than four decades. But the policing of  
37 prostitution was reactive rather than proactive, and generally a low state  
38 priority: women working alone in their home, flats, clubs or via escort agencies  
39 were very much 'out of sight and out of mind' (Prior and Hubbard, 2013) and  
40 crackdowns on street work infrequent. However, changing sexual norms,  
41 gender roles and developments in the sex industry itself have put pressure on  
42 the law and prohibitionist approaches (based on a logic of reducing demand  
43 for sexual services) have gained much traction since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup>  
44 century.  
45  
46

47 Significantly – and despite the presentation of evidence that male and trans-  
48 identified workers constitute as much as one third of those who sell sex  
49 (Cusick et al, 2009) - the government's framing of prostitution policy has been  
50 strongly gendered, with the female sex worker increasingly figured as  
51 exploited rather than exploitative, and in need of protection rather than  
52 needing to be protected from. Here, it is clear the national discourse has been  
53 heavily influenced by radical feminist arguments suggesting sex work is  
54 inherently exploitative of women. The increasing citation of the 'Nordic' model  
55 of regulation that criminalises the purchase of sex work outright is entirely in  
56 keeping with this (Skilbrei and Holmström, 2013). In England and Wales,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 policy currently stops just short of this, but responsabilises or punishes parties  
4 engaged in buying and selling sexual services (Scoular and O'Neill, 2007).  
5 This is manifest in new laws which increase punishment for kerb-crawlers,  
6 allow for the closure of premises suspected of being used for prostitution,  
7 force convicted sex workers to engage with 'exit' strategies and withdraw  
8 impunity from those who purchase sex from anyone who has been coerced  
9 into doing so by a third party. In relation to the latter, anyone who buys sex  
10 from an individual who is later found to have been coerced now commits an  
11 offence, even if they were not aware of the coercion at the time (Scoular and  
12 Carline, 2014).  
13  
14

15 The framework for the adoption of such laws was a wide-ranging review into  
16 Sexual Offences - *Setting the Boundaries* - in 2003. This Home Office review  
17 was informed by a 'violence against women' agenda seeking to reform rape  
18 laws to increase justice for victims. However, as the review progressed, the  
19 government decided prostitution warranted a dedicated review. The  
20 subsequent 2004 Home Office *Paying the Price* consultation - which in turn  
21 led to the production of the 2006 *Coordinated Strategy on Prostitution and*  
22 *Tackling the Demand for Prostitution* in 2008 - fell short of promoting explicit  
23 criminalisation, and sought instead to achieve similar ends via the increased  
24 penalisation of clients alongside efforts to 'empower' those involved in selling  
25 sex by forcing them to recognise their victimisation and seek to exit (e.g.  
26 through compulsory 'engagement and support orders' served on those found  
27 guilty of soliciting).  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 Evidence in policy

33  
34 The extent to which recent shifts in policy are evidence-based is moot.  
35 Certainly, academic submissions to government consultations, and related  
36 evidence, show a wide variety of modes of selling sex, and diverse  
37 experiences across different sectors (O'Neill et al, 2015). Yet, in recent policy  
38 documents, the sex industry has tended to be portrayed in a homogenized  
39 way: commercial sex has been recast as the commercial sexual exploitation  
40 of women, with male clients pathologised and represented as a species of  
41 sexual offender (see Kingston and Thomas, 2014). For example, men who  
42 buy sex on the street are described as 'indirectly supporting drug-dealers and  
43 abusers whilst perpetuating a market fraught with violence and abuse' (Home  
44 Office, 2006, p. 12) at the same time their activities impact on negatively on  
45 local communities. This has led to the adoption of 'naming and shaming'  
46 policies and amendments to the offence of kerb-crawling. The latter was  
47 already a summary offence (*s71 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001*) and as  
48 a result of *s19 Policing and Crime Act 2009* there is no longer a requirement  
49 of persistence. Hence, it can be seen that kerb-crawling is now a status-  
50 based, as opposed to a nuisance-based, crime (Scoular and Carline, 2014).  
51  
52  
53

54 At the same time, concerns about the prevalence of migrant workers in the  
55 sex industry has produced an empirically-unjustified but widely mediated  
56 'moral panic' about trafficking (see Hubbard and Scoular, 2009). In England  
57 and Wales this has involved the circulation of myths of manipulative migrants  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 from Eastern Europe engineering flows of women to the UK, coercing them  
4 into sex working: those women involved are regarded as passive victims  
5 rather than agential subjects who may be working in the sex industry because  
6 of the relatively good working conditions, pay and flexibility it offers them, or  
7 the way it allows them to look after their families, partners or others (Mai,  
8 2012). Such representations of passivity and exploitation have helped fuel  
9 more general discourses that link migration to the UK with sexual immorality  
10 and criminality, and made a strong case for policies designed to reduce the  
11 perceived influx of sex workers by tackling demand. As noted above, this has  
12 resulted in an increased stigmatisation of the purchasers of sex, with section  
13 14 of *Policing and Crime Act 2009* criminalising the act of paying for adult  
14 sexual services for the first time by making it an offence to pay for the sexual  
15 services of someone subject to exploitative conduct by a third party (Scoular  
16 and Carline, 2014).  
17  
18

19  
20 The discourse suggesting that sex work is endemically exploitative reinforces  
21 the view that prostitution is a sector where men exploit women, and makes  
22 the case for the adoption of the 'Nordic model'. Yet this policy positioning of  
23 women involved in sex work as 'victims' relies on a host of generalizations  
24 about who is involved:  
25

26  
27 Most women involved in street-based prostitution are not there through  
28 choice. They are amongst the most vulnerable people in society.  
29 Nearly all are addicted to heroin or crack or both. Many come from  
30 abused childhoods and many are homeless. And many become  
31 involved before they reach 18 (Home Office, 2006, p. 17).  
32

33 This provides a stereotyped view of street workers as chaotic victims, and  
34 denies they might have any choice in the work they do. Similarly, it has been  
35 asserted that there is an inherent association of trafficking and sex work, but  
36 that:  
37

38  
39 Trafficking for sexual exploitation forms a significant part of the  
40 prostitution market in this country but exploitation can take other forms  
41 and women involved in prostitution can be controlled by another in  
42 order for that person to profit from this involvement. This control can  
43 and does take the form of a range of exploitative practices such as  
44 threats of violence, or the provision of accommodation or drugs solely  
45 on the condition of being a prostitute (Home Office, 2008, p. 8).  
46

47  
48 Such instances of exploitation are known to exist. However, academic studies  
49 imply they are exceptional, and not normal, contrary to the dominant policy  
50 rhetoric (see O'Neill et al, 2015). Irrespective, policy is predicated on the idea  
51 that significant numbers of street workers are addicted and vulnerable, and  
52 likewise that the majority of indoor workers are trafficked or exploited in some  
53 way. Neither group of workers is allowed to possess agency: the idea women  
54 may work independently, and experience their work as pleasurable or  
55 lucrative is ignored.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Such tendencies towards depicting all sex work as harmful were exacerbated  
4 by the 'All Party Parliamentary Group on Prostitution and the Global Sex  
5 Trade', convened between 2008-2013 'to develop proposals for government  
6 action with a focus on tackling demand for the sex trade' (APPG, 2014, p. 4).  
7 Despite the direct oral presentation of peer-reviewed evidence from the  
8 authors demonstrating that much sex work is not exploitative, and that it is not  
9 directly or inherently connected to trafficking, the report emerging from this  
10 group (which was given secretarial support by Christian Action Research and  
11 Education) recommended '...reducing the demand for sexual services, by  
12 transferring the burden of criminality from those selling sexual services onto  
13 those who facilitate or create the demand for its sale' (APPG, 2014, p. 9). The  
14 discourse, mirroring 'Nordic' feminist rhetoric, is about the 'harm' that women  
15 experience and the incompatibility of prostitution with gender equality aims.  
16 The recommendation here was in essence about using the criminal justice  
17 system to reduce 'demand' and, implicitly, about modifying the moral  
18 landscape via legislative reform.  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Prohibitionism: ineffectual policy?**

24  
25 The logic of reducing demand to reduce harm assumes the safety of sex  
26 workers can never be guaranteed, and that eradicating sex work is the only  
27 possible answer. This disregards alternative approaches promoting harm  
28 reduction through decriminalisation or legalisation. For example, recent data  
29 from New Zealand, which adopted full decriminalisation of sex work in 2003,  
30 suggests that decriminalization makes working women more able to report  
31 sexual violence and seek the protection of police (Abel et al, 2009), and  
32 hence improves their safety and well-being. Likewise, studies of the situation  
33 in New South Wales, Australia, where sex work is regulated through  
34 environmental rather than criminal law, demonstrate the considerable benefits  
35 of a system that regards prostitution as legal and regulates the spaces where  
36 it occurs as a space of work, not a site of criminality: rates of violence against  
37 sex workers, nuisance complaints and exploitation within the sector are  
38 known to have declined since decriminalisation (Prior et al, 2013) while overall  
39 demand for sex has remained constant (Rissell et al, 2016). Comparison  
40 between different regulatory systems within Australia further supports the view  
41 that decriminalisation has benefits over legalisation (as practiced in  
42 Queensland), 'minimal' decriminalisation or containment (as in Western  
43 Australia) or outright prohibition (as practiced in Tasmania) in terms of  
44 benefits for sex workers, communities and local government (Crofts and  
45 Summerfield, 2006; Sullivan, 2010).  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 This given, it appears that the shift to more punitive position is at least in part  
51 informed by a moral rather than analytical position. In effect, the emerging  
52 approach in England and Wales appears informed by a form of moral  
53 opprobrium, perhaps originated in religious doctrine, that suggests sex work  
54 must be harmful because it is sinful. A key factor supporting this view has  
55 been the prominence in both national and local media coverage of the  
56 presence of migrant workers in the off-street sex work industry, something  
57 that has raised understandable anxieties about the possibilities of trafficking  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and the criminal exploitation of these workers. This has been manifest in  
4 police raids on premises where migrant women are known to work, many  
5 carried out by the police as part of national programmes led by the UK Human  
6 Trafficking Centre ('a multi-agency centre' that it is 'police-led' but also  
7 involves the HM Revenue & Customs, the Crown Prosecution Service, the  
8 Serious Organised Crime Agency and the UK Border Agency). While these  
9 raids revealed little obvious coercion or sex trafficking in their initial phases  
10 (e.g. Operation Pentameter, 2004-06), concerns about trafficking have  
11 continued to circulate, especially London, where the numbers of 'migrant' sex  
12 working men and women is thought to be highest (Cusick et al, 2009).  
13  
14

15 It was talk of the trafficking of 'Eastern women' that provided the case for  
16 clamping down on London's informal sex trade in the run-up to the Olympics  
17 2012. Eighty brothels were raided in Newham in 2011-12 alone while  
18 Westminster City Council made repeated attempts in 2012-13 to close flats  
19 used by female sex workers in Soho. A critical report by Andrew Boff (2012, p.  
20 5) suggested such raids had less than one percent success rate in identifying  
21 victims of trafficking, concluding that 'police have been proactively raiding sex  
22 establishments without complaint nor significant intelligence that exploitation  
23 is taking place'. The organisation 'Open Doors' that provides outreach to sex  
24 workers in London, argued that this, and a 'juggernaut' of publicity, created a  
25 situation where 'women who have been working off-street, safely, are now on  
26 the street selling sex in a much less safe environment' (cited in Boff, 2012, p.  
27 10). Such raids on brothels have then created new fears and vulnerabilities  
28 among workers, with this large-scale 'clean up effort' creating an inhospitable  
29 climate for sex workers, significantly compromising their safety (and arguably  
30 making them less likely to report abuse, exploitation, and other crimes).  
31  
32  
33

34 Intrusive policing in some areas of London, and in particular the Boroughs that  
35 were home to the Olympics, have hence changed the geography of sex work  
36 in the city, with some limited displacement of sex work from off-street to street  
37 environments (Hubbard and Wilkinson, 2014). Whilst it is hard to evidence  
38 these trends, information from grassroots projects suggests that nationally  
39 there has however been a significant long-term shrinkage of street sex work  
40 markets, with sex workers assumed to have moved into various off-street  
41 locations rather than leaving sex work all together. At face value, the move to  
42 off-street working appears beneficial from a harm reduction perspective: on-  
43 going work by Sanders et al (see [www.beyond-the-gaze.com](http://www.beyond-the-gaze.com)) is beginning to  
44 understand how selling through website platforms (e.g. AdultWork) allows sex  
45 workers to advertise and organize their work with limited surveillance by the  
46 authorities and with benefits in terms of their ability to negotiate the terms of  
47 selling sex. But once operating in this effectively deregulated online  
48 environment there are further risks and issues of safety that are only  
49 beginning to be understood. For instance, Sanders et al, (2015) found that for  
50 a significant number of escorts who operated independently through online  
51 media, safety was a significant concern. Of 240 internet based sex workers  
52 surveyed, new types of crimes were noted such as harassment by text and  
53 email, as well as clients attempting or threatening to 'out' the sex worker in  
54 public to their family and friends (Sanders et al, 2015). So while early  
55 research studies into online sex work environments demonstrate certain  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 benefits of this mode of organising and advertising commercial sex, they also  
4 highlight certain areas of risk which are not even acknowledged in  
5 contemporary prostitution policies that remain predicated on a stereotyped  
6 understanding of what sex work is and how it effects those involved (see  
7 Sanders et al, 2017).  
8  
9

## 10 11 **Conclusion**

12  
13  
14 Commercial sex is, and always has been, part of the leisure industry. But like  
15 many pleasurable activities, it is one sometimes regarded as sinful: indulgent,  
16 wasteful, excessive, criminal and dirty. This paper has suggested that this  
17 conflation of immorality and prostitution is one that currently dominates in  
18 policy-making circles in England and Wales, as in much of Europe. The  
19 consequence of this is the pursuit of a simplistic model of harm reduction (i.e.  
20 eradicating prostitution by reducing demand for sexual services). The  
21 espousal of such a model is one resting on a partial reading of evidence, and  
22 an unswerving pursuit of a Nordic model whose overall impact on the health  
23 and well-being of sex workers and society as a whole remains highly  
24 contested (see Skilbrei and Holmström, 2013). In this sense, the espousal of  
25 the Nordic model appears to rest on moral intuition as much as the existence  
26 of clear-cut evidence about the pros and cons of this particular regulatory  
27 approach.  
28  
29

30  
31 This said, academic comparisons of different approaches to the regulation of  
32 sex work elsewhere suggest that decriminalisation – whether in full or part –  
33 offers a more tried and tested model of harm reduction. Decriminalisation can  
34 reduce policing costs, diminish the stigma surrounding sex work, and produce  
35 a safer working environment for women (and men). For example, analysis of  
36 reports of violence against sex workers in New South Wales 2001-2008,  
37 where brothels are decriminalised and managed via the planning system,  
38 suggests extremely low rates of violence, rape and robbery, with around forty  
39 reported instances per year for a working population assumed to be as high  
40 as 8,000 across the state (Prior et al, 2013). In comparison, data from the  
41 English city of Liverpool, where the number of sex workers known to the local  
42 outreach project was around 400, suggests attacks numbered around 30-40  
43 per year over the same period (Kinnell, 2008). As such, risks of violence were  
44 as much as twenty times higher for those working in England and Wales as  
45 opposed to the decriminalised New South Wales model even at a time when  
46 there was a push towards reducing demand and penalising clients. To the  
47 contrary, research by the authors (and others) suggests that the 'Nordic'  
48 model has driven sex work underground, and on-line, where workers are  
49 subject to as yet unknown and undocumented risks (Hubbard et al, 2008;  
50 Levy and Jakobsson, 2014). The conclusion that the Nordic model reduces  
51 the overall amount of sex work (see Jakobsson and Kotsadam, 2013) also  
52 needs to be questioned in the light of the fact that prostitution as a whole is  
53 less visible in Sweden and Norway because of its illegal status.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 We conclude by suggesting that academic evidence is being selectively read  
4 and quoted in on-going processes of policy-making in England and Wales.  
5 Our experience as participants and 'experts' in these processes does not  
6 convince us that prostitution policy in England and Wales conforms to the  
7 ideals of evidence-based policy; to the contrary, it appears that the  
8 government seeks policy-based evidence, and is quite willing to disregard or  
9 even distort academic evidence to justify its stance. As such, it appears a  
10 precautionary principle prevails: instead of considering aggregate trends or  
11 patterns, policy-makers seem persuaded by media articles which take  
12 extreme or even isolated cases of exploitation and vulnerability,  
13 representations that fit certain pre-conceived notions that the sinful must be  
14 harmful. This is not to say that cases of exploitation do not exist – academic  
15 studies confirm their prevalence (Day, 2007) – but academic research shows  
16 risk is not endemic to all forms of sex work. Seeking to avoid such instances  
17 of harm, the legislative response nonetheless appears to be about moving  
18 towards the criminalisation of *all* sex work (with a 2016 Home Affairs Select  
19 Committee sitting to consider the recommendation of the All Party  
20 Parliamentary Group that the criminalisation of purchase becomes law). And  
21 though the stated aim of this mooted change is the prevention of gendered  
22 exploitation, academic evidence from elsewhere suggests sex purchase will  
23 be driven underground, with clients purchasing sex online, in clandestine  
24 spaces or abroad.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 Our conclusion is that the mooted criminalisation of sex work purchase in  
30 England and Wales will not achieve the aims that its supporters believe it will  
31 (i.e. the disappearance of prostitution), and will also not promote the type of  
32 harm reduction that might be best achieved via the decriminalisation that  
33 many academics in England and Wales advocate. Moving forward, we hence  
34 advocate policy based on rigorous, comparative studies of the effects of  
35 prostitution policy in different jurisdictions. The fact that such studies remain  
36 relatively rare is perhaps one explanation as to why morality tends to reign  
37 supreme in this particular policy field: quite often academics appear unable to  
38 answer the key questions policy-makers want answering, and it is this that  
39 encourages them to rely on media sources and their own inherited intuition as  
40 they construct 'policy stories' (Stevens, 2012). Here then, there is much that  
41 those studying prostitution can learn from alcohol and drugs research, where  
42 there has already been plentiful discussion of how specific notions of morality  
43 and evidence collide to construct particular views of 'what works' (Lancaster,  
44 2014).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Abel, G.M., Fitzgerald, L.J., and Brunton, C. (2009), "The impact of decriminalisation on the number of sex workers in New Zealand", *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 38 no. 3, pp. 515-531.
- All Party Parliamentary Group (2014), *Shifting the Burden: Prostitution and the Global Sex Trade*, HMSO, London
- Boff, A. (2012), *Silence on Violence. Improving the Safety of Women*, London, Report from the Lord Mayor of London's Office.
- Carline, A. and Scoular, J. (2015), "Saving Fallen Women Now? Critical Perspectives on Engagement and Support Orders and their Policy of forced Welfarism", *Social Policy and Society*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 103-112.
- Crofts, T. and Summerfield, T. (2008), "Red light on sex work in Western Australia", *Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 33, pp. 209-215.
- Cusick, L., Kinnell, H., Brooks-Gordon, B., and Campbell, R. (2009), "Wild guesses and conflated meanings? Estimating the size of the sex worker population in Britain", *Critical Social Policy*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 703-719.
- Day, S. (2007), *On the Game. Women and Sex Work*, London, Pluto Press.
- Henricson, C. (2016), *Morality and public policy*, Bristol, Policy Press.
- Home Office (2006), *Co-ordinated Prostitution Strategy*, London, HMSO.
- Home Officer (2008), *Tackling Demand*, London, HMSO.

1  
2  
3  
4 Hubbard, P., Matthews, R. and Scoular, J. (2008), "Regulating sex work in  
5 the EU: prostitute women and the new spaces of exclusion", *Gender, Place*  
6 *and Culture*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 137-152.  
7

8  
9 Hubbard, P. and Prior, J. (2013), "Out of sight, out of mind? Prostitution policy  
10 and the health, well-being and safety of home-based sex workers", *Critical*  
11 *Social Policy*, vol. 33 no. 1, pp. 140-159.  
12

13 Hubbard, P. and Scoular, J. (2009), "Making the vulnerable more vulnerable?  
14 The contradictions of street prostitution policy", in Canter, D., Ioannou, M. and  
15 Youngs, D. (eds.), *Safer sex in the city*, Farham, Ashgate, pp. 135-153  
16

17  
18 Hubbard, P. and Wilkinson, E. (2014), "Welcoming the World? Hospitality,  
19 Homonationalism, and the London 2012 Olympics", *Antipode*, vol. 47 no. 3, pp.  
20 598-615.  
21

22 Jakobsson, N. and Kotsadam, A. (2013), "The law and economics of  
23 international sex slavery: prostitution laws and trafficking for sexual  
24 exploitation", *European Journal of Law and Economics*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 87-  
25 107.  
26

27  
28 Kinnell, H. (2008), *Violence and Sex Work in Britain*, Cullompton, Willan.  
29

30  
31 Kingston, S. and Thomas, T. (2014), "The police, sex work, and Section 14 of  
32 the Policing and Crime Act 2009", *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*,  
33 vol. 53 no. 3, pp. 255-269.  
34

35  
36 Lancaster, K. (2014), "Social construction and the evidence-based drug policy  
endeavor", *International Journal of Drug Policy*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 948-951.  
37

38  
39 Lawrence, S. (2015), "Expert-Tease: Advocacy, Ideology and Experience in  
40 Bedford and Bill C-36" *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, vol. 30, no. 1,  
41 pp. 5-7.  
42

43  
44 Levy, J. and Jakobsson, P. (2014), "Sweden's abolitionist discourse and law:  
45 Effects on the dynamics of Swedish sex work and on the lives of Sweden's  
sex workers", *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, vol. 14 no. 5, pp. 593-607.  
46

47  
48 Mai, N. (2012), "The fractal queerness of non-heteronormative migrants  
working in the UK sex industry", *Sexualities*, vol.15, no. 5-6, pp. 570-585.  
49

50  
51 Matthews, R. (2005), "Policing Prostitution: Ten Years on", *British Journal of*  
*Criminology* vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 1-20 .  
52

53  
54 O'Neill, M., Maginn, P., Hubbard, P., Bowen, R. and Laing, M. (2015),  
55 "Decriminalisation of sex work and social justice for sex workers: time for  
56 evidence-based policy", prepared for evidence session, House of Commons,  
57 November, available at: <http://tinyurl.com/jyaz577>.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Outshoorn, J. (2012), "Policy change in prostitution in the Netherlands: from  
4 legalization to strict control", *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, vol. 9, no.  
5 3, pp. 233-243.  
6

7  
8 Pates, R. (2012), "Liberal laws juxtaposed with rigid control: An analysis of the  
9 logics of governing sex work in Germany", *Sexuality Research and Social  
10 Policy*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 212-222.  
11

12  
13 Prior, J., Hubbard, P., and Birch, P. (2013), "Sex worker victimization, modes  
14 of working, and location in New South Wales, Australia: a geography of  
15 victimization", *Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 50 no. 6, pp. 574-586.  
16

17  
18 Rissel, C., Donovan, B., Yeung, A., de Visser, R.O., Grulich, A., Simpson,  
19 J.M. and Richters, J. (2016), "Decriminalization of Sex Work Is Not  
20 Associated with More Men Paying for Sex: Results from the Second  
21 Australian Study of Health and Relationships", *Sexuality Research and Social  
22 Policy*, online early.  
23

24  
25 Sanders, T., Connelly, L., Jarvis-King, L. and Feis-Bryce, A. (2015), "Internet-  
26 based sex workers: Working conditions and job satisfaction". Briefing Paper  
27 available at: [https://uknswp.org/um/national-ugly-mugs-and-leeds-university-  
28 job-satisfaction-survey/](https://uknswp.org/um/national-ugly-mugs-and-leeds-university-job-satisfaction-survey/)  
29

30  
31 Sanders, T., Connelly, L. and Jarvis-King, L. (2017, forthcoming), "On Our  
32 Own Terms: The Working Conditions of Internet Based Escorts in the UK"  
33 *Sociological Research Online*  
34

35  
36 Scoular, J. and O'Neill, M. (2007), "Regulating Prostitution: social inclusion,  
37 responsabilization and the politics of politics of prostitution reform", *British  
38 Journal of Criminology*, vol. 47 no. 5, pp. 764-778.  
39

40  
41 Self, H. (2003), *Prostitution, Women and Misuse of the Law: The Fallen  
42 Daughters of Eve*, London, Frank Cass.  
43

44  
45 Skilbrei, M.L. and Holmström, C. (2013), *Prostitution Policy in the Nordic  
46 Region: Ambiguous Sympathies*, Farnham, Ashgate.  
47

48  
49 Stevens, A. (2011), 'Telling policy stories: an ethnographic study of the use of  
50 evidence in policy-making in the UK', *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 40, no. 2,  
51 pp. 237-255.  
52

53  
54 Sullivan, B. (2010), "When (some) prostitution is legal: the impact of law  
55 reform on sex work in Australia", *Journal of Law and Society*, vol. 37, no. 1,  
56 pp. 85-104.  
57

58  
59 Wagenaar, H. and Altink, S. (2012), 'Prostitution as morality politics or why it  
60 is exceedingly difficult to design and sustain effective prostitution policy',  
*Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 279-292.



1  
2  
3 Wolfenden (1957), *Report of the Departmental Committee on Homosexual*  
4 *Offences and Prostitution*, London, HMSO.

5  
6 Zampini, G.F. (2014), "Governance versus government: Drug consumption  
7 rooms in Australia and the UK", *International Journal of Drug Policy*, vol. 25,  
8 no. 5, pp. 978-984.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Drugs and Alcohol Today