

The Naked Truth About Getting Naked

☒ So, a few weeks ago, my nephew sent me a link to the following webpage, “W Magazine Replies to Kim Kardashian’s Tears Over ‘Porn’-y Nude Pics.”

Let me start out by saying that I find anything Kardashian disgusting and try to avoid reading about Kim or the rest of the litter. I still remember their father, Robert, who was on “inactive” status as an attorney at the time of the OJ Simpson murder investigation but changed to “active” status after he spoke with OJ. Actually, he hadn’t practiced law for about 20 years at the time of the Simpson/Goldman murders. My guess is that he had to protect whatever OJ told him but actually had to be acting as OJ’s “attorney” to assert the “attorney-client privilege.” I still remember the look of absolute disbelief on Kardashian’s face when the jury came back and found OJ “not guilty.” But I digress – it’s okay; I’m old.

I’ve never seen an episode of “Keeping Up With the Kardashians,” “Kourtney and Khloe Take Miami,” or “Kourtney and Kim Take New York;” I’ve never seen an episode of Dancing with the Stars when Kim was a contestant, and I certainly don’t intend to read “Kardashian Confidential.” In fact, it’s even disturbing that Wikipedia describes Kim as “an American celebutante, socialite, television personality, producer, actress, and model, rather than as a “daughter-of-attorney-who-became-famous-for-doing-absolutely-nothing-except-make-a-pornographic-home-video-with-her-then-boyfriend-which-unsurprisingly-got-uploaded-to-the-internet.”

Well, she’s now bellyaching about the photos taken of her for W Magazine’s Art Issue. Apparently, on a recent episode of “Kourney & Kim Take New York,” she “burst into tears” over her naked pictorial spread in W magazine. Claiming she was

misled, she moaned that the pictures were “full-on porn.” She complained that “the whole concept was sold to me that nothing would be seen.”

Can you believe this? Kim, think about it. There wasn't a gun pointed at your head. You took off your clothes. Someone pointed a camera at you. Someone took pictures of you. They then put those pictures in a magazine and now you don't like it. There were no hidden cameras. You didn't have any clothes on. What's your problem?

A quick check on the internet will result in hundreds of photos of Kim Kardashian with very little clothing on. Is she trying to convince the public she didn't see proofs of the “W” photos or didn't have final say in their publication? Give me a break.

But it gets even better. She had already done a nude photo spread for Playboy and apparently didn't like those pictures either and tried to block their publication. A little advice to Kim: If you don't like it, keep your clothes on and stop crying.

She reminds me of the rest of these idiots who send nude photos of themselves over the internet. Take for example, the case of George Bronk, 23. He got e-mail addresses of women on Facebook, hacked into the accounts of dozens of women, scanned their “sent” folders for nude and seminude photos and videos and forwarded them to all of the women's contacts. He then coerced one of these numbnuts to send him more explicit photos by threatening to distribute the photos he already had.

Obviously, what this guy did was wrong. But explain to me how stupid someone has to be to send nude photos of themselves over the internet.

And what about sexting? If you're going to do this with your phone, expect the whole world to know about it. There's

nothing private anymore and there are losers somewhere in their mother's basements waiting to hack into anything.

So, whether you're sexting, sending photos by email, putting them on your FB page, whatever, once they're out there, they're out there. Women, men, kids, wise up. In today's tech world, no one should have the expectation of privacy.

I don't get it, but if you do, God bless you.