

[This was grabbed from the old site of ZV... Formatting was adjusted, although some images may be lost. Citations from quotes mentioned from beastforum.com can no longer be pulled up as the site no longer exists.]

A very long article going into detail about taboos against bestiality and zoophilia, why such are illogical in a sexual reasoning framework.

TL;DR - zoos are discriminated against, and should practice civil disobedience against anti-bestiality laws.

<https://www.quora.com/How-long-until...lity-is-broken>

About as long as speciesism and denial of humans being in the animal kingdom or being animals and therefor zoosexual by nature because of your attraction to a human animal. Zoosexuality is a sexual orientation in which humans are sexually attracted to animals. Although people have been having sex with animals for centuries, it has largely been condemned, ignored, and marginalized by society. The reason for this negative attitude towards sexuality is due to ignorance and bigotry, which has led to zoosexuality being stigmatized by society and made a taboo subject. But what exactly does it mean for something to be “taboo”?

Taboo is a word which means “[being] proscribed by society as improper or unacceptable”; it is also defined as “exclusion from use or practice, to ignore or ridicule”. Compare this with the definition of “controversial”, which is “subject to controversy; debatable”. Taboo subjects and controversial subjects often overlap.

Because of this, some subjects in society are publicly debatable, controversial, and easy to bring up (such as abortion or health care reform) – nobody is ashamed of bring up their point-of-view. However, taboo subjects (such as bestiality, nudity, and subjects which have to do with sex and death) are considered unacceptable by society, stigmatized, and ignored as thoroughly as possible. They are irrationally censored. I refer to this as “social erasure”; the collective artificial amnesia created by a society to attempt to eradicate a way of thinking. This has been common throughout history; for example, blacks prior to key moments (such as the Civil Rights movement) were often ignored.

Another group of people that have suffered from “social erasure” are gays. In the 1950s, for example, being gay wasn’t even debated; it was “brushed under the table”, ignored, stigmatized and considered taboo. However, through the 1960s and onwards, gay rights eventually became more mainstream and began to become OK to talk about; in the year 2000, there were zero U.S. states that allowed gay marriage; there are now 7 (and DC) — and that number is growing. The social attitude towards the taboo of homosexuality has changed over the years; in a sense, it has gone from being “taboo” to not being a big deal.

However the same cannot be said for zoosexuality; it is a group which have not made the progress that gay rights has made; it has remained in the darkness, locked up by society; this is largely due to the fact that our culture is based on certain moral values derived from Christianity

and other religious sources.

Whenever the “hidden” subject of zoosexuality is brought up by someone, no matter how articulate and rational the argument may be, the chances are high that the resulting reaction will involve social stigma, disgust, or a non-rational knee-jerk response.

Why are certain things considered taboo? And why is zoosexuality so taboo? Surely, one could not pick a more taboo subject. It is so taboo that it could almost be considered analogous to homosexuality in the 1950s. In my 15 years (and counting) of education, I have only heard the subject mentioned once or twice, and in those cases, it was only mentioned briefly and negatively. I have never seen a television show about it. It is apparently even too taboo for National Geographic’s “Taboo” series to show.

SECTION 2: ADDRESSING ZOOSEXUALITY

According to the Internet, **zoosexuality** (also known as zoophilia) is defined as a human sexual attraction to a non-human animal; this has been viewed as being its own unique sexual orientation known as “zoosexuality”. Meanwhile, the term “bestiality” refers only to actual sex acts with animals, whereas “zoophilia” and “zoosexuality” refer to the broader sexual attraction to animals. Because the term “bestiality” has negative connotations and is associated with anti-zoosexual bigotry, the politically correct term for bestiality is “**zoosexual act**”. A zoosexual act is an act in which a human has inter-species sex with a being who happens to be non-human (including, but not limited to, sexual intercourse, oral sex, etc.) Here is a quote by a zoophile describing it further:

“Zoophilia is best described as a love of animals so intimate that the person (and the animal) involved have no objections to expressing their affection for each other in the sexual fashion. This is not to be confused with bestiality, where a person forcefully mates an animal, without their consent, and with no mutual feelings whatsoever. This is something that I would never do to [an animal], since I love them dearly, and treat them with the same respect that an honest husband would have for his wife and children.” — Anonymous,

<http://www.zoophile.net/dolphins...>

The group of people who have sex with animals can be divided into **two categories**:

> Category #1: The **majority** (people who love animals romantically and would never harm them — they are known as “**zoosexuals**”)

> Category #2: The **minority** (people who only use animals as objects in order to have sex with them — they are known as “**bestialists**” — people who are “bestialists” [aka “zoosadists”] don’t care about the animal’s welfare). Most people who have sex with animals are **not** in category #2.

Most people who have sex with animals are called **zoosexuals** (they are the people who love animals, would never harm animals, and treat animals as sentient beings with their own rights). Sometimes zoosexual people are called “**zoos**” (an abbreviation). Unfortunately, the media tends to disproportionally report cases involving “bestialists”, and this harms the reputation of innocent zoosexuals, as well as the public’s perception of zoosexuality. When people see these media reports, they come to the erroneous conclusion that **all** people who have sex with animals are “bestialists”, which **isn’t true**.

The Internet seems to be the **only source** providing information about zoosexuality; due to its taboo and stigmatized nature and its “social erasure”, you would never learn this type of information in school or on TV (I didn’t, and you probably didn’t either).

If something is stigmatized and ignored, it leads to a mass ignorance. For example, normal sex between humans is generally considered taboo in most cultures (it is censored on TV and only done in private); because of these restrictions, people end up becoming more reckless because they have less knowledge. This has led to the widespread transfer of the HIV virus from one person to another. Why was the virus spread? Because people weren’t informed; they weren’t educated properly. Why weren’t they educated properly? Because the issue was ignored. The

result is a massive pandemic. The general sexual stigma brought on by centuries of religious dogma has inadvertently resulted in the deaths of thousands of people.

It is mass ignorance which has caused zoophilia to become taboo. Because it is loathed, feared and poorly understood by people, it is not included in school curriculum. It is also excluded from religion, excluded from popular culture (except for humorous remarks), and often condemned by the law. This is based on long held irrational traditions and beliefs that date back many, many years. Fear seems to be a driving force behind the condemnation of zoosexuality. As Bertran Russel said, "Collective fear stimulates herd instinct, and tends to produce ferocity towards those who are not regarded as members of the herd". If a person stands out for any reason, there is apparently something wrong with you. If you face the wrong way on the elevator, for example, there is apparently something wrong with you. And it is this **conformity**, which is responsible for the persecution of smaller, minority groups such as zoosexuals; because their ways are not similar to the majority, they are condemned. This was (and to a degree, still is) true of homosexuals, bisexuals and people of other orientation, but hasn't caught on with zoosexuals.

An article on [Science News, Articles, and Information](#) (see link at bottom of Blog) says the following:

"This individual, who shall go unnamed unless he wishes to identify himself in the comments section, was a self-professed "zoophile" (Greek for "animal lover") with a particular romantic affinity for horses, and he was hoping that I might devote one of my column pieces to this neglected, much-maligned topic of forbidden interspecies love. "The politics of acknowledging zoophilia as a 'legitimate' sexual orientation," wrote this reader, "often mean that zoophiles are either ignored as a class or subject to what can only be described as the most vicious, sustained, and hateful attacks by mainstream society." I have my own viscerally based, unreasoned biases and—I confess—on first reading this email I promptly mentally filed it away in the untouchable "Eww..." category. But [a story], combined with my sympathy for human underdogs, inspired me to go back and reread it, and I saw a rather intriguing scientific question lurking there. Is it really possible for an otherwise normal, healthy person to develop a genuine sexual preference for a nonhuman species?"—<http://www.scientificamerican.co...>)

This is an example of how even "normal" people are beginning to question at a basic level what it means to be zoosexual.

SECTION 3: PEOPLE'S IRRATIONAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS ZOOSEXUALITY

Although there may be social reasons for ignoring and/or condemning zoosexuality, one reason for the taboo of zoophilia may be evolutionary; from a biological point of view, having sex with animals makes no sense because it doesn't result in any offspring; consequently, the only humans that survived were humans that had sex with other humans, and because of this it became hard-wired into the DNA of their descendants (ultimately, most humans). This might explain why when someone is approached with the idea of zoosexuality, their initial reaction might be "eww, that's gross" or "that's perverted". It's because they're not used to such "abnormal" ideas because society has told them it's wrong and they are biologically programmed to do so. However, keep in mind that saying "that's gross" is not a philosophical argument; it does not rely on any rational reasoning system to determine whether or not zoosexuality is moral. There are rational arguments that could be made for or against zoosexuality; for example, a

utilitarian argument for zoosexuality is that it increases happiness so long as both parties are satisfied.

Most people do not react rationally when confronted with the idea of zoosexuality; most react with an irrational, visceral, knee-jerk reaction. This reaction is caused by ignorance and societal conditioning. Luckily, as the following quotes demonstrate, not everyone reacts this way:

“According to [articles], the ‘yuck’ or purity factor is a part of all moral systems, being hardwired into us. The logical justifications of morality tend to be rationalizations of what people already believe[...] sex with animals (unless it involves cruelty or abuse) should not be illegal.” — Amos

“Disgust doesn’t determine morality. It troubles me that people would even consider throwing logic out the window, simply because it doesn’t jive with their feelings[...] Most people don’t take it to the level I have in the [zoosexual] thought experiment obviously, but I find it unclear exactly where the moral line was suddenly crossed... if there is a line at all. Many farm animals are artificially inseminated, so that requires masturbation of male animals, and artificial insemination of a female, which sometimes require some manual stimulation to make them ovulate. Is that wrong? [...] Again, I’m stunned at the willing dismissal of reason. Essentially in saying that logic is only used to reinforce existing beliefs, you’re saying that it doesn’t matter what my arguments are, you’re simply not going to change your mind, and you essentially don’t even need to consider my arguments, because your mind isn’t going to be changed by reason. How can we be philosophers with such a mindset?” — Wayne Yuen

“Now, as for [an enlightened person], who no doubt belongs to PETA and doesn’t eat meat but loves to curl up with his dog on dark and rainy nights [sexually] ... this person would be hard to condemn.” — Jean Kazez

*“OK, in my mind [the ‘yuck’ factor] seem blown out of proportion. The yuck factor should not play a role in [examining zoosexuality]; look at it logically, ethically, etc. If there is nothing wrong, no one gets hurt, what is wrong with it? There were a lot of things that made us think yuck in the past, but we’ve moved on, and maybe we can move on with as well. People **actually** find attraction to these animals, don’t ask me how, but they do, and sometimes it escalates to the most intimate thing possible for living beings.” — John Wu*

Above quotes: <http://blog.talkingphilosophy.co...>

“‘Right’ and ‘wrong’ are purely subjective human constructs based on the cultural morals with which we are raised. People consider [sex with animals] wrong because that is what they were taught growing up. If they hadn’t been taught [that way], they wouldn’t have that belief of ‘wrongness’, even if they had no desire to engage in such behavior[...] Ethics and morality are simply attempts to define guidelines that will allow us to make the best possible choices.” — Kuve, <http://answers.yahoo.com/questio...>

SECTION 4: ZOOSEXUALITY IN NATURE

Above: Interspecies sex occurs in nature; humans are just like any other species (in terms of sex) and should not be excluded from the Animal Kingdom

Scientific research has explored homosexuality in other animals and found that homosexuality in non-human animals is a trait that “eases up” the gene pool, and has lead scientists to the conclusion that homosexuality in humans is evolutionarily good because it eases up the gene pool. If this is the case, then zoosexuality might also be seen as “easing up” the gene pool because it, like homosexuality, does not result in offspring. Additionally, animals from different species have been observed mating with each other. A National Geographic article said the following:

“The act of mating with a species other than your own may not be as ill-advised or peculiar as it seems.[...] A growing number of studies have been presented as evidence that two species can combine to produce a third, sexually viable species in a process known as hybrid speciation[...] Scientists now believe that the behavior [inter-species sex] that has been called animals’ sexual blunders could be an important force in their evolution. [...] ‘In the past, people have often viewed hybridization as a mistake’ Mallet said. ‘But this is probably not an unnatural phenomenon. And, he said, ‘Sex with another species may occasionally be a very good idea. [...] It might be worth throwing the dice every now and then to trying for something really weird and see if it works out.’ Occasionally, [inter-species sex] produces sexually fertile offspring that may have the opportunity to evolve into a separate species.” — <http://news.nationalgeographic.c...>

If a human and a dolphin have sex, chances are high that there will be no fertile offspring. However, there is a slight chance that a new species (human-dolphin hybrid) could be produced. The above quote comes from the National Geographic article “*Interspecies Sex: Evolution’s Hidden Secret?*” It suggests that there is nothing wrong with inter-species sex because it is a normal part of nature. The only reason humans do not usually engage in inter-species sex is because irrational ways of thinking (such as religious dogmas) are acting as a strait jacket, preventing people from doing what nature intended. Remember, because humans are animals, they can have inter-species sex just like any other species. Because inter-species sex is a normal part of nature (and a beneficial part of nature), why should humans avoid it? By not having inter-species sex, the human race is actually *weakening* itself in the long run.

If inter-species sex and zoosexuality do in fact have evolutionary benefits, then it would seem that the only reason zoosexuality is a taboo, stigmatized subject is not necessarily because of biology, but because of social constructs.

Just remember, animals in the wild can and do have sex for non-reproductive purposes. For example, they have homosexual sex (i.e. anal sex) and they also masturbate. Because of this (and because of the fact that animals in the wild have interspecies sex), it is illogical to say that bestiality is “unnatural”, and it is illogical to say that an animal’s “instincts” are being violated; on the contrary, when a human has sex with another animal, they are not doing anything “unnatural”; in addition, the instincts of the animal are not being “violated”. One could easily argue that many of the thing’s humans do (like neutering animals and using artificial insemination on animals) are more unnatural than having sex with an animal.

Regarding this issue, this is what I said in another post:

*“Many socially accepted practices which humans engage in all time are **more** unnatural than having sex with an animal (zoosexuality). For example, acts such as neutering, artificial insemination, experimentation, zoos/aquariums and factory slaughter are all **unnatural** activities, yet their “unnatural-ness” is never questioned. Even though zoosexual acts are **more** natural than neutering/slaughter etc., they are called “unnatural” by anti-zoosexual people as a “mask” to hide their underlying irrational prejudice and bigotry against zoosexuality.”*



Above: interspecies sex occurring between a lion and a tiger — this scene may have been in captivity, but there are instances of inter-species mating in the wild.

Click the following link to see a short video showing interspecies sex between a variety of animals: [\[link to interspecies sex video \(Huffington Post\)\]](#); it proves that interspecies sex is not uncommon, and that it is part of nature (thus destroying the argument that it is “unnatural” for humans to have sex with other animals). I was unable to embed it into the post.

SECTION 5: UNJUST HATRED OF ZOOSEXUALITY VIA RELIGION AND CULTURE

Most cultures today have a deep-seated irrational hatred of zoosexuality which cannot easily be explained. This hatred is often expressed in the form of bigotry and anti-zoosexual discrimination, and it is largely caused by ignorance (an ignorance which exists because of the irrational taboo surrounding zoosexuality).

It is worth noting that in today's society, zoosexual people are often bullied (due to hatred, fear, ignorance and bigotry) — and because of this bullying, they often become depressed and hide their zoosexual feelings from people (see [anti-zoosexual bullying](#)). It is important for zoosexual people to recognize that there is nothing wrong with them, and that compassion for animals and an ethical zoosexual lifestyle can bring them happiness in life. They should realize that there is something wrong with society itself (specifically, society's fierce intolerance to those who are different).

Earlier, I mentioned “social constructs”.

A **social construct** is a way in which something is done socially to make definitions easier. For example, the very notion of “sexual orientation” is a social construct; in reality, the neatly defined boundaries of “straight”, “gay” and “bisexual” are blurred.

Zoosexuality has occurred throughout history, and there are even some places that have statues depicting human-animal sexual intercourse. Of course, you'd never know about those statues because you'd never learn about them in school, but it is true that zoosexuality was actually a part of life for many different cultures throughout the ages, such as some Native American tribes, Inuits, and the Maasai people of Africa. However, with the introduction of Abrahamic religions (Christianity, Judaism and Islam), new irrational and intolerant moral codes were put into place that created strict social constructs in the form of religious texts such as the Bible and Quran that condemned zoosexuality (or simply ignored it). One of the moral codes imposed by these religions was the rather puritanical point-of-view that zoosexuality is “abnormal” and should be punishable by a fine, a prison term, or even death. Some of these archaic moral codes have lasted all the way into the 21st century, with laws in various places prohibiting zoosexual acts. Religious ways of thinking have been so strong that zoosexuality has been essentially eliminated from mainstream thinking.

Thus, over centuries of social constructs being in place, society turned against zoosexuality and made it taboo, even if zoosexuality served a biological purpose. For most of history until the 1960s, homosexuality and zoosexuality were very much alike – stigmatized, ignored sexual orientations. The 1960s is where the two-split apart; LGBT became more acceptable, while zoosexuality remained in the dark. Because the civil rights movement did not include zoosexuality, this means that zoosexuality is one of the final social issues that society has to confront. Additionally, keep in mind that until 1990, homosexuality was listed as a “mental illness”. According to [“Find The Right Care”](#), zoophilia is still listed as a mental illness and is regarded as a “disease”. (This is a form of [zoosexual discrimination](#).) How would a gay person feel if you went up to them and told them that their orientation was a disease? That's probably the way zoophiles feel. Whereas homosexuality has been accepted by the medical/psychological community and by society in general, zoosexuality has not (even though it should be).

This is an example of how psychological “definitions” really only reflect what society thinks, and don’t necessarily reflect the weather something is *actually* an illness. Calling zoophilia an “illness” is discrimination.

Ultimately, why would religious people be so determined to eradicate taboo topics such as zoosexuality? Several explanations are possible; firstly, many religious people would say “because God said so”, but this “argument” cannot be taken seriously because there is no rational philosophical argument behind it. Secondly, many religious people simply conform to what the majority in their religion do, and they may not think about what they’re doing. Even subtle things, for example, are typically done but not questioned, such as religious rituals (like making monotonous repetitions of familiar phrases in church or bowing down in a mosque). As a result, if those with authority say zoosexuality is immoral, then people are more likely to believe it to be true. And, if everyone in their religious circles believes zoosexuality is immoral, they believe it must be true since the majority believes it. But keep in mind that back in the late 1700s, the majority of people in America believed that slavery was OK. Even George Washington (who was a slave owner) believed slavery was OK. Because of this, the “majority rationale” is discredited. What is considered moral/immoral today might be completely different in the future.

Thirdly, religions in the past held superstitions such as the false belief that having sex with an animal would produce “monster” offspring; this may have something to do with religious intolerance of taboo subjects such as zoosexuality. Finally, a large part of most religious dogmas is the idea that humans are “above” non-human animals, and because of this, they claim that God has made a “separation” between humans and non-human animals because humans are somehow “better” than non-human animals. This concept is known as “human exceptionalism”, and it is a delusional and irrational way of thinking. It is also an arrogant and anthropocentric way of thinking. In reality, humans are **not** superior to non-human animals (people who believe in “human exceptionalism” are too delusional to realize this).

The following quote discusses the arrogant “human exceptionalism” belief:

“The frame of mind [of our society] is that we humans are the best species, the most advanced, the most intelligent, the most superior and have a ‘God-given’ right. So, all other species (despite their ability to feel and have emotions just as we do) are ‘beneath’ us. In fact, [according to our society], non-human animals are not communities or individuals with their own interests, but objects and resources to be exploited. Here in lies the problem: having a sexual partner implies that the two are equals; and if that partner is a non-human animal, that contradicts the paradigm above.” —<http://www.createdebate.com/deba...>

Another thing to keep in mind is that the “arguments” that extreme religious people use against zoosexuals are the same “arguments” that they use against homosexuals. For example, evangelical Christians often cite specific passages of the Bible to “justify” their hatred of homosexuals. The same is true of those who practice bestiality (zoosexuals) — religious people “pick and choose” specific passages from the Bible which appear to be anti-zoosexual (these passages conform to their **preconceived prejudices** against zoosexuals). However, what these people fail to realize is that the Bible **as a whole** can be interpreted as being **in favor** of zoosexuality (and the same applies for homosexuality). In other words, a few sentences from

Leviticus is **not enough** to condemn homosexuality and zoosexuality; it is an **excuse** used by evangelical Christians to justify their preconceived hatred, intolerance and bigotry.

Many arrogant religious people (those who believe in “human exceptionalism”) make the fallacious and delusional claim that humans are “superior” to non-human animals, and they justify it with passages from the Bible.

It is extremely important to remember that humans are **not** superior to non-human animals (because humans **are** animals). The archaic, religiously derived idea that humans are “above” other animals is **incorrect** and a **falsification of reality**. Humans are **equal** to other animals and are **not** superior to them. Thus, when a human has sex with another animal, it is **not** immoral. People say humans are superior because of language, culture, etc; but remember that other species have characteristics which **humans lack**; for example, dolphins have a complex echo-location system which humans lack, and sharks can sense electromagnetic fields, another characteristic humans lack. Making the claim that humans are “above” other animals is **arrogant, speciesist, and anthropocentric**. In a nutshell, **we are all on this planet together**: no species is “better” than another. People need to stop being “human supremacists”.

People already believe certain kinds of sexuality are “immoral”, and then use their religious text as a justification. But as we have seen, these people only choose the sentences which fit their intolerant views. They **ignore** other parts of the religious text that **contradict** their beliefs (for example, passages which could be interpreted as being in favor of bestiality and/or zoosexuality). The stuff said about Leviticus is not valid, especially since there are plenty of Leviticus rules which people violate all the time. There are also things said in Leviticus which are pro-slavery — so why is it that people ignore the part about slavery but always choose the parts which appear to be anti-gay and anti-zoosexual? Because it fits their own prejudice and intolerance.

Consider this quote:

“[In response to a typical anti-zoosexual Bible-clinging person]: There’s enough people bastardizing and twisting the Bible to suit their own meaning and agenda. Do you really have to jump on that bandwagon? If you want to argue against something, study the matter and develop real, logical, rational arguments based on empirical evidence from actual observation and psychological/sociological research studies [and do not use religion]. [Do not try to] reinterpret lines from a book older than the concept of shaving. The bible very explicitly condones slavery and the treatment of wives as property, yet modern society has abandoned those very antiquated ways for something more civilized. You don’t get to pick and choose what ancient mystical babble to attempt to control the private lives of people with.” —

Sky, <http://answers.yahoo.com/question/...>

Ultimately, people need to **stop** thinking about zoosexuality in religious terms. All forms of zoosexuality (both ethical and unethical) should be thought of in a **secular** framework. This is because religion is **not provable**, and thus any arguments for or against zoosexuality which are based on religious beliefs are **not valid**. The notion that there is an authoritarian, human-like God who has specific moral beliefs and “watches” over people is **utterly ridiculous**.

Considering the fact that the Earth (on a cosmic scale) is equal to a grain of sand on beach, it is **extremely arrogant and anthropocentric** to assume that God is a human-like entity (especially

since there are **trillions** of planets, and humans are just **one species on one planet**). The following is **likely**:

- 1) Religion is a falsification of reality, over-simplifies things too much, acts like a virus, and primarily exists because of the following: people's fear, ignorance, laziness, inability to think for themselves, desire to conform to a group, the quixotic desire to know all the answers of the universe without having to think about anything, desire to feel good about themselves, and desire to stroke the over-inflated ego of humanity
- 2) Human attempts to define God (via religion) have failed miserably and are contaminated with anthropocentrism
- 3) "God" is probably extremely different from the way humans envision it
- 4) "God" probably does not have consciousness as we know it
- 5) "God" probably does not think like a human and therefore cannot "watch over" people and cannot make "moral" judgments (humans have to create their **own** moral compasses); in addition, God is not "personal"
- 6) "God" is inseparable from the natural world
- 7) Randomness, entropy and disorder are probably manifestations of "God"
- 8) People will never be able to know the **true nature** of "God"
- 9) "God" is an entity beyond human comprehension

The only reason I have brought up these points about religion is because in so many cases, *religion* is what **prevents** people from accepting zoosexuality. If people thought about the universe rationally and logically (i.e. by understanding the above 9 points) and stopped believing in a fictional version of reality, maybe they'd be more accepting of zoosexuality. People need to **think for themselves**, stop assuming that a human-like God is "watching" over them, and stop being slaves of religion. Unfortunately, irrational religious beliefs continue to prevent zoosexuality from being accepted in many societies.

SECTION 6: ZOOSEXUALITY IS ERRONEOUSLY THOUGHT OF AS “ABUSIVE” AND “IMMORAL”

But religious followers are not the only ones who have contributed to the social taboo against zoosexuality; bioethicists, delusional animal rights activists, and various law enforcement units have condemned zoosexuality as animal “cruelty”. Because religion has embedded itself so deeply into society, one could make the argument that religion has indirectly influenced these groups, though there’s no way to prove that. However, many animal rights groups believe zoosexuality is wrong because of non-religious issues; mainly, they claim it is animal “cruelty”. The truth is that zoosexuality and bestiality do not always involve animal cruelty; in fact, most zoophiles are **not** cruel to animals. (see [animal rights groups should not be against zoosexuality](#))

The president of PETA, Ingrid Newkirk, is one of the few animal rights activists who supports zoosexuality. She said the following about zoosexuality:

“If a girl gets sexual pleasure by riding a horse, does it matter? If not, who cares? If you French kiss your dog and he or she thinks it’s great, is it wrong? We believe all exploitation and abuse is wrong. If it isn’t exploitation and abuse, it may not be wrong.” -Ingrid Newkirk

So, this brings up a fundamental problem – what exactly is animal cruelty? How exactly can we know what is going on in the minds of animals? Humans think they know what is going on in the minds of animals, but do they really know? If non-human animals can feel pain (which they definitely can), then does zoosexuality count as causing pain to the animal? If in fact certain kinds of zoosexuality don’t cause pain to the animal, then is it ethical?

Firstly, let’s look at human-human sexual relationships. Typically, they are considered to be either good or bad. Either the human-human sexual relationship involves mutual consent, or it is rape. In many rape cases, the aggressor injured the victim. Similarly, many reports of zoosexual crimes involve a human injuring or killing an animal while having sex with it. These incidents are definitely crimes, just as human-human rape is definitely a crime. However, if a non-rape, non-injury human-animal relationship is comparable to a non-rape, non-injury human-human relationship, can it still be condemned? In other words, where does one draw the line between zoosadism (harm to animals) and genuine zoosexuality, in which someone respects for and/or cares for the animal in question? Because only zoosadism events are reported by the media, is that why the social perception of zoosexuality is so negative?

People need to realize that there is a distinction between zoosexuals who have loving relationships with animals, and zoosadists, whose sole purpose is for personal gratification and injury to the animal. Here is a quote from the Scientific American:

“In other recent surveys, the majority of zoophiles scoffed at the notion that they were abusive toward animals in any way—far from it, they said. Many even consider themselves to be animal welfare advocates in addition to zoophiles.”

(quote source: <http://www.scientificamerican.co...>)

According to this article, zoosadists have negatively tainted the public perception of zoosexuality. From this point, one could then come to the conclusion that animal rights activists have incorrectly put the “good” zoosexuals with the “bad” zoosexuals into the same “bad” category.

Below is a quote which supports the above quote about the (correct) notion that most zoosexuals are **not** being cruel to animals:

“[With regard to zoosexual sex involving a dog]: Once again, if the dog is in discomfort or doesn’t like it in any way – STOP and leave it be.” —

Dirtyfox, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

The follow quote highlights some of the complexities regarding specific zoosexual orientations (i.e. people who are attracted to a specific species):

*“[A] man was hooked up to a penile plethysmograph and shown nude photos of all varieties and ages of humans, the man was decidedly flaccid. Nothing happening down there either when he looked at slides of cats, dogs, sheep, chickens, or cows. But he certainly wasn’t impotent, as the researchers clearly observed when the subject was shown images of horses. [He was only aroused by images of horses]. This case and related anecdotal evidence reported by the authors were important at the time because they suggested that zoophilia may be an extraordinarily rare—but real—type of minority sexual orientation. That is to say, for some people, having sex with their animal “lovers” may amount to more than just substituting human sex with the next best thing. Rather, for them, sex with nonhuman animals **IS** the best thing.” —*

<http://blogs.scientificamerican....>

The above quote shows that many zoosexual people **prefer** to have sex with non-human animals, and that in many cases they are sexually attracted to a certain kind of animal (in this case, horses). Some zoosexual people are sexually attracted to multiple animal species (which may also include humans — remember, humans are a species of animal too). A post I made (“[the zoosexual orientation wheel](#)” goes into more detail about this).

Zoosexuality is diverse (as diverse as the Animal Kingdom itself) when it comes to specific attractions: some people are [sexually attracted to dogs \(cynosexuals\)](#), some people are [sexually attracted to horses \(equinosexuals\)](#), some people are [sexually attracted to dolphins \(delphinosexuals or delphinophiles\)](#), some people are [sexually attracted to pigs](#), some people are [sexually attracted to lizards](#), some people are [sexually attracted to crocodiles](#), some people are sexually attracted to ostriches — the list goes on and on. As I said before, in many cases the above attractions overlap (so, for example, there are people who are sexually attracted to dogs, humans and horses, but not sexually attracted to pigs).

Below are more quotes about zoosexuality which attempt to destroy commonly-held misconceptions and stereotypes about zoosexual people:

“Bestiality, or zoophilia as they prefer it to be called, has been around since the beginning of time. Sheep herders and farmers have often had sex with animals, but it’s usually joked about or regarded as something done of necessity when no women were available. Now, instead of just

seeing it as a behavior, they want it to be seen as a sexual orientation. Research has been done on these people and it seems that some legitimately prefer animals. [...]

And for those of you who might be thinking they abuse animals with this behavior (“interspecies sexual assault”), zoophiles adamantly disagree. Because they love animals and care deeply for them, they claim they would never do anything to hurt them.[...]

If he prefers to be with horses over humans, should we judge him for this or just let him be? [...]
So, these people [zoophiles] prefer animals over humans, they are not particularly distressed about their sex life, and they care about the animals and apparently wouldn't hurt them. That doesn't seem so bad, does it? [...] The animals are not hurt, and likely won't even remember the next day. Are any of YOU getting hurt by this? No, you're not.” —
<http://www.divinecaroline.com/22...>

Also, although there are many anti-zoosexual media reports about animals supposedly being “abused” by zoophiles, even those reports often admit that the animals involved are not actually harmed in any way; for example, read this quote from the Huffington post:

“[Regarding a man who had sex with a dog in NC:] Animal Control director Dr. John Lauby said the examination showed no physical injury to the dog. He said he doubts the attack will leave lasting trauma. ‘With dogs, the dominant animal breeds with the others, so I don't think there will be psychological damage,’ Lauby told The Huffington Post.” —
<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/20...>

Anti-zoosexual media reports often use biased language to describe zoosexual people in a negative way: for example, they use inaccurate and denigrating words such as “molest”, “abusive”, “heinous”, “perverted”, “rape”, “assault” and “attack”, all adding unjust negativity to reports which should (in theory) be neutral. Below is an excerpt from a bigoted anti-zoosexual Nigerian news article:

“[Tunde Aramide]: Apart from being barbaric, unnatural, repugnant and unjustifiable, those who practice bestiality are abusers of animals who capitalize on the nature of these animals to take undue advantage of them. Bestiality, if you consider it critically, is synonymous with animal rape and other forms of sexual abuse against them. It is illegal and those who do it should be prosecuted. Those who abuse animals sexually or otherwise are guilty of God's judgment, because God never wants them exploited.[...] High Chief Yemi Elebuibon described bestiality as inhuman and barbaric” —<http://www.tribune.com.ng/sun/sp...>

A zoosexual who was offended by the above bigoted comments said the following:

*“[The above comments] should anger ANY zoosexual person — it is pure bigotry. For example, the use of the word “inhuman” is inaccurate because humans were never “above” other animals to begin with. Also, when a lion has sex with a tiger, does that make a lion “in-lion”? And if a dog has sex with a cat, does that make the dog “in-dog”? Why is it that ONLY when it comes to humans, something is suddenly called “inhuman” if that person has sex with an animal? It's all such bull****. Bestiality is not “inhuman”, it is not “barbaric” and it is not “repugnant”. Also, bestiality is not “unnatural” because interspecies sex happens in the wild.*

People need to change their moral compasses. They need to realize that when a human has sex with a non-human animal it is not “immoral” because humans ARE animals, and all animals

(including humans) are sexual beings, many of whom are capable of having sex for pleasure. Zoophiles need to fight against the kind of bigotry seen in the above mentioned article.

Also, remember this fact: according to [Dictionary.com - The world's favorite online dictionary!](http://www.dictionary.com), the definition of "inhuman" is: "lacking qualities of sympathy, pity, warmth, compassion, or the like; cruel; brutal". After seeing many threads on this forum, I can say without any hesitation that most zoosexual people ARE compassionate and DO have warmth/sympathy for animals. In fact, it would appear that zoosexuals tend to be MORE compassionate towards animals than the average person. Thus, one **cannot** called zoosexuality "inhuman", because it **directly contradicts** the dictionary definition." — Zqwm7, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

In the quote below (from my [zoosexual discrimination](#) post), I describe why the Nigerian article is flawed, irrational and bigoted:

"[The above comments in the Nigerian article are] pure bigotry. It is especially disturbing that such discriminatory words (such as "inhuman", "repugnant" and "barbaric") are used. The use of religion is offensive because it is clear that religion (as an "argument") is being used as a "mask" or "facade" to hide people's intolerance and prejudice. It should be clear to everyone that these hateful beliefs are based on a flawed system of morality. I will now explain in detail why bestiality is not what the above quote claims it to be.[...]

*[There is] plenty of proof that most zoosexual people are compassionate towards animals (which is also why many of them are also vegetarians — they would never harm an animal). Why don't people call eating an animal's meat "inhuman"? After all, I doubt most people who eat a hamburger have "compassion" for the animal they're eating. In addition, most zoosexual people have far more sympathy, pity, warmth and compassion for animals than the average person. And most zoosexual people are not cruel to animals. Thus sexual relations between humans and other animals is **not** "inhuman".*

This is the [Dictionary.com - The world's favorite online dictionary!](http://www.dictionary.com) definition of "barbaric": "Without civilizing influences; uncivilized; primitive". Bestiality is not barbaric because it is just like regular human-to-human sex, except in this case it is an interspecies relationship. Bestiality is no more "barbaric" than "regular" human-to-human sex. Because humans ARE animals, and because humans have intrinsically the same characteristics as other animals (at least when it comes to sex), it is a fallacy to call such behavior "uncivilized" or "barbaric". The slaughter and killing of animals is far more barbaric than having mutually pleasurable sex with them.

This is the [Dictionary.com - The world's favorite online dictionary!](http://www.dictionary.com) definition of "repugnant": "distasteful, objectionable, or offensive". The "yuck" factor should never be involved when trying to determine something's moral worth. Just because someone thinks that anal sex between two men is "disgusting" and "repugnant" doesn't make it an immoral act. The bigoted comments made in the above website ARE offensive"; zoosexual acts are NOT. People should not view zoosexual activity as being "distasteful" because there is nothing "distasteful" about a human who has mutually pleasurable sex with another sentient being who happens to be a non-human animal. Humans have sex with other humans all the time, and since humans ARE animals, then that means that humans have sex with animals all the time (just animals of the same species). Thus, anyone who claims that interspecies sex is "distasteful" should also believe that human-to-

human sex is “distasteful”. Personally, I do not understand why people are so disgusted by interspecies sex, since there is nothing “disgusting” or “distasteful” about it. In addition, when mutually pleasurable sex is occurring between a human and non-human animal, and if that animal is not being harmed in any way, there should not be anything “offensive” about such an act.

I also want to take the time to discuss some other factors of discrimination in the Nigerian article:

Firstly, the overuse of religion. Religion should never be used as an argument for or against something, as it is not provable. And also, as is the case with this Nigerian article, religion is often used as a “smokescreen” or “red herring” to distract people from the real issues at hand, and religion is often used as a “mask” to hide people’s underlying prejudice.

Secondly, the use of the terms “animal rape” and “sexual abuse”. If one argues that a human who has sex with a non-human animal is “rape”, then one must also conclude that a lion who has sex with another lion in the wild is “raping” that lion, because the submissive lion did not necessarily agree to have sex with the dominant one. The “consent” argument is a red herring used by anti-zoosexuals as an excuse to hide their bigotry; it does not have any validity, especially since people slaughter and kill animals all the time without asking for their “consent”, and because consent is not a meaningful concept from the non-human animal’s point-of-view. “Consent” is not a big deal for non-human animals; it is an anthropocentric concept. And also, bestiality is not “sexual abuse” because “abuse” implies that something is immoral, and (as already discussed in this post), bestiality is not immoral; other factors need to be involved in order for a zoosexual act to be immoral (such as inflicting injury). Thus, the premise under which “sexual abuse” lies is flimsy and falls apart.

Thirdly, there is the fallacious and flawed belief that animals are being “taken advantage of” and “exploited” when people have sex with them. This is not true, just as a dolphin in the wild who has sex with another dolphin is not “exploiting” that dolphin. Animals make it clear when they don’t want to have sex; if a horse doesn’t want to have sex with a person, he/she can kick him/her. Dogs such as rottweilers can do similar damage — they can theoretically rip out a person’s throat. Also, if an animal has sex with a human and that animal doesn’t have a problem with the sex (and is enjoying it), then that animal certainly isn’t being “exploited” — he/she is being a willing participant (or at the very least, a happy participant). The act of slaughtering/killing/hunting an animal is exploiting them, whereas having sex with them is far less likely to involve “exploitation” (and think about this: if a dog wants to have sex with a human and that dog wants his/her sexual desires fulfilled, then it is actually the HUMAN who is being exploited by the dog!)

Lastly, zoosexual acts should not be automatically illegal. The only acts that should be prosecuted are the ones in which zoosadism and cruelty were clearly inflicted on the animal. Non-cruel zoosexual acts should not be prohibited by the law.

It is also worth noting that the Nigerian article also made the claim that those who engage in zoosexual acts are “mentally ill”, which is not true (though many of them have become mentally ill as a result of constant anti-zoosexual bigotry being aimed at them). Zoosexuals are not

“mentally ill” in the same way that homosexuals are not “mentally ill”; if a person’s condition does not cause that person distress, then that person is not suffering from a “mental disorder”.” — <http://vividrandomexistence.word...>

It is important to remember that people with an anti-zoosexual prejudice have been known to sometimes deliberately harm an animal, so it looked like a zoosexual person did it. For example, consider this situation: an ethical zoosexual person has ethical sex with his/her dog — this person is unjustly arrested and their dog is unjustly taken to an animal control facility — once the dog is there, the veterinarian realizes that the zoosexual person did not harm the dog in any way, and so he/she (the veterinarian) deliberately injures that dog so that he/she can justify their anti-zoosexual bigotry and use their false (fabricated) evidence to unjustly condemn a zoosexual person. There is a Wikipedia article about this kind of situation: see [False Evidence](#). Unfortunately, it is easy for a veterinarian to get away with this kind of deception because most people are strongly, hatefully and irrationally anti-zoosexual (“zoophobic”).

Another irrational association people make with zoosexuality is its alleged association with “violence”. Although zoosexual acts can be benign, most people erroneously put zoosexual acts into the same category as violent acts (even though those same people would never put *artificial insemination* into the “violent” category):

“In other words, [according to Ms. Butts of the SPCA], letting your male dog have sex with you is just the same as hitting, kicking, or attacking him [this is absolutely incorrect]. Here’s a question: if it’s OK for a vet or breeder to masturbate a dog to collect semen, why would it be a felony for the owner to do that just for fun? [i.e. zoosexuality]. From the dog’s perspective, it’s the same action either way. A hand job is either an “attack” or it isn’t. Unless what we are really worried about isn’t the well being of the dog, but what human sexual behavior we find “acceptable” or not...” — Tharsis5, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

In response to the above quote, dirtbiker2000 said the following:

“Tharsis, the problem is you are thinking about this logically and intelligently, [which are] two things missing from a lot of peoples brains when thinking of this subject. And you are dead right, none of these laws are about preventing abuse. That is just a way of spinning it to try and get the public on the side of the anti-zoo bigots. [The laws are really about enforcing a specific irrational “moral” view].” — dirtbiker2000, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

However, many animal rights advocates don’t care about whether or not people are “abusive” to animals; all they care about is whether or not the animal is capable of “consent”. As I will explain, this is a [flawed argument](#). According to the dictionary, consent means to “permit, approve, or agree; comply or yield”. Animal rights activists and other groups claim that because animals cannot verbally communicate to us about how they feel (like a human), they are incapable of consent. But wait a minute; can you really never tell what your pet dog is thinking? If your dog has something on its mind, can’t you tell what it wants by observing its behavior? If your dog was in pain, wouldn’t you notice it? What if your dog comes up to you and humps your leg? If the animal initiated the interaction, then does it still count as human-initiated “rape”?

Regarding the issue of “consent”, here is a quote:

“One of the most infuriating arguments used to deride animals is that they can’t speak—which implies they can’t speak a human language. None of us, of course, can speak a word of an animal language, but some animals have made serious headway with ours” — Ingrid Newkirk, The PETA Practical Guide to Animal Rights, p.13

What this quote suggests is that the term “consent”, which is a human-centric term used between humans, cannot be applied to non-human animals because they don’t understand our language. Instead, non-verbal communication and body language would be needed to satisfy the “consent” issue in people’s minds (an issue that non-human animals probably don’t think about).

Here are two more quotes regarding the “consent” issue:

*“Many animal rights advocates [believe that] bestiality is synonymous with animal abuse. Animals cannot consent in a meaningful way to sexual contact, they argue, so human-animal sex is akin to ‘rape’. The problem with this reasoning is that animals cannot consent — under the legal definition of that term — to **anything**. We do not describe owning a pet dog as kidnapping, even when the canine is restricted to the inside of a home, although confining a human being in the same manner would clearly be unethical.” — <http://www.opposingviews.com/i/t...>*

“If an animal actively seeks out sexual interaction with a human, displays behaviors associated with sexual receptiveness and gives no counter indications when approached sexually by a human, or permits a human to engage in sexual activity without showing signs of aversion, in the absence of any physical coercion, the animal can be said to be a consenting party to the act inasmuch as they are demonstrating active desire, permission or compliance.” — <http://www.inter-disciplinary.ne...>

Also, consider the following consent-related quotes:

“My male dog used to tell me that he was interested in sex or wants it. He would beg me until I give in. Am I misreading him? No, he would sniff at my crotch and paw at me. He only does this when he wants sex. This is Consent, both by me and by him. Any Zoo knows that animals if they want it, it may ask a human for sex. Zoos know that animals’ consent. There is no question about it!” (Source: <http://dpsblog.blogspot.com/2006...>)

“I don’t know about other people’s dogs, but mine gets very excited and thrusts back on me, and almost knocks me down if I stop mounting her. Unlike what all the animal rights people want to think, my dog loves sex [with me], and won’t stop at anything to get it.” — <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

The above quotes involve the [sexual attraction to dogs](#), which (like [the sexual attraction to dolphins](#)) is one of many sexual orientations on the [zoosexual orientation wheel](#).

Perhaps the consent issue is so complicated because humans do not fully understand animal cognition; perhaps, in the future, if humans have a better understanding of it, they would be able to make better judgments. Remember that the whole idea of consent is a human-centric concept. As I will discuss with dolphins, animals in the wild have often been seen “raping” each other.

However, keep in mind that using the word “rape” is anthropomorphizing. Consider this quote from a commenter named “jalousface” on Scientific American:

“There is no moral attachment to sex in the animal kingdom as there is to humans. Nor will the animal be in psychiatric care discussing the time some human had sex with it. Sex isn’t as big a deal for animals as it is for humans. Feel for the people attracted to the animals, imprisonment won’t help nor solve the problem.”

(quote source: <http://www.scientificamerican.co...>)

This commenter brings up an interesting point: the very idea of sex itself may be completely different for non-human animals; for humans, sex is stigmatized and heavily controlled, whereas sex for animals is just as common (and public) as consuming food.

Here is a quote regarding this issue:

“I wonder if my grandma’s German Shepherd — my first sexual partner — wracked himself with guilt for years after seducing me because he realized only far too late, after the fact, that I was probably incapable of making an informed decision whether or not to play around with him because my sense of smell was nowhere near as highly well developed as his own. You know? For some odd reason, I seriously doubt it.” — shinyferret, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

The above quote emphasizes the fact that “consent” is an anthropocentric (human-centric) concept, and that non-human animals probably don’t care about issues like “consent” the way humans do. Compared to humans, non-human animals probably have a laid-back, non-stigmatized perception of sex (a perception which is inclusive of interspecies sex). The above quote also emphasizes the fact that the differences between humans and other animals (i.e. sense of smell, perception of sex, “consent”, etc) do not negatively affect animals when they have sex with humans. In addition, the differences are not enough to justify the prohibition of zoosexual activity.

Consider dolphins, which are intelligent mammals with large brains. In the wild, the males regularly force the females to have sex. This could not be considered “rape”, because that is a term associated with human social conventions and applying it to animals could be anthropomorphizing. Aspects such as this one support the idea that animals do not have “morals” the way humans do; what would be considered “immoral” to a human (such as sex with an animal) would not also be considered “immoral” to a non-human animal because whether or not something is “moral” or “immoral” is a distinctly human way of thinking. For a non-human animal, sex is probably just like eating food and is not attached to morality the way it is for humans.

Ultimately, the act of a human having sex with another animal **is not intrinsically “abusive”**. The only way it is “abusive” is if other factors are involved (for example, if the animal is clearly injured because of the sex, then it is abusive. But if no harm occurs, it is not abusive). I will discuss this in the next section with the “harm principle”. If a human and an animal have sex with each other, both enjoy it and neither are harmed by it in any way, it should **not** be called “animal abuse”.

It is possible that one of the reasons people charge zoophiles with “animal abuse” is because they are using that term as a “mask” to hide the *real* reason for prosecuting them: their deep-seated irrational disgust and bigoted hatred toward zoosexuals.

Here is a quote by a zoosexual person regarding the fallacious and erroneous belief that all zoosexual activity is “abusive”:

“There are a lot more of us [zoosexuals] than you know or even care to acknowledge. Yes there [are a few people] who “use” animals (technically known as “Bestialists”), and I don’t at all support them or what they do. You need a SIGNIFICANT and POWERFUL emotional attachment to be a TRUE Zoophile [or zoosexual]. Not all have romantic relationships but love their animal partners still as much as anyone does a Soul Mate. We are quite diverse in our beliefs as well. Some [zoosexual people] may not agree with some comments or ways others do believe, including my own. We [zoosexuals] are not “sick”. What’s considered “WRONG” is only in one’s mind, not in real fact, and many of the hateful comments and anti-zoosexual “propaganda” used is created by irrational people who can’t see clearly the truth — they use the same [slanderous] remarks over and over against something they don’t understand [and don’t] have. They are ignorant and just say and rely on what others say and can’t think on their own.

I know a great many [zoosexual people] are even religious, and they see their nothing wrong about their life — [to them, their zoosexual life is] a form of true Unconditional Love. Many, if not most, human relationships never stay strong and they drift apart forever. Tell me, is there any “True love” in that? [Zoosexual people] truly love their animals until the day they die and beyond. We [zoosexual people] are also human and our [interspecies] love will not change because of others. Especially not mine. I personally don’t judge the lives of others (and their ways) because of the irrational thoughts of others. Humans ARE ANIMALS and are going to do what they do. And if you can’t see eye to eye or at least the facts, that’s fine, just don’t put down and absolutely hate something you don’t understand, [and don’t force your delusional view of “morality” on me by trying to criminalize zoosexual acts].” — Rebel of the Sacred Heart,
<http://blogs.scientificamerican...>

With regard to the issue of “morality”, this is what I said in another post:

“[Morality] is only what the majority thinks. For example, the majority of people in the U.S. South in the early 1800s thought slavery was morally OK. Was it? Of course not! Not only is morality a societal construct, it is completely relative — what is “immoral” today might not be “immoral” 10 years from now.

*Saying something is “immoral” is also a bad argument because **morality is relative**. The term for this is **moral relativism**; a related term is **cultural relativism**. In a nutshell, these terms refer to the fact that what one society thinks is “immoral” may be completely moral and acceptable to a different society. For example, historically the Maasai people of Africa and some Native American groups (such as the Hopi Indians and Copper Inuit) were accepting and **tolerant** of human-animal sexual activity. They did not have a negative attitude towards it because their societies had not yet been contaminated with the delusional, hateful, religiously-driven “moral”*

beliefs of Europeans (i.e. Puritans). The fact that there were (and are) societies that accept zoosexual activity is proof that morality is relative. **Interspecies zoosexual activity is not objectively “immoral”**; depending on who one talks to, the response will be negative or positive. Unfortunately, the “negative” culture (i.e. the culture which is hostile towards zoosexuality) is the dominant culture right now. But that **does not** make it a correct culture.

Also, many zoosexual people will argue that when they have sex with an animal, it is not an “immoral” action because it is non-abusive, does not inflict pain or suffering on the animal, and because of other factors (i.e. the animal is willing to have sex, the animal enjoys sex with the human, the animal initiated the sex, etc). In terms of ethics, having sex with an animal can be seen as morally acceptable according to specific ethical viewpoints (for example, the utilitarian viewpoint or the harm principle viewpoint). From these viewpoints, it can be argued that **some** kinds of zoosexual activity (i.e. those which involve zoosadism) are immoral/cruel, but that other kinds of zoosexual activity are not immoral. People often fallaciously and erroneously lump the bad kinds of zoosex into the same category as the good kind.

Typically, when someone says zoosexuality is “immoral”, they’re not really thinking hard about the issue — they’re simply thinking with their “gut” and using emotional, hateful, knee-jerk beliefs and their own irrational aversion to it. They’re also probably conforming to what the dominant culture thinks (in other words, they aren’t thinking for themselves. They are letting the culture do the thinking for them — brainwashing).” — Common Arguments Against Zoophilia (and why they fail) post

SECTION 7: REAL LIFE ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN HUMANS AND OTHER ANIMALS

There is evidence to support the notion that dolphins are willing to have interspecies sex. For example, according to one website, a person recorded his account of swimming with a dolphin, in which the dolphin was apparently sexually interested in him (see [this link](#).) In similar event caught on video, a dolphin is seen apparently having some kind of sexual interest in a woman:

The sexual attraction to dolphins is known as [delphinic zoosexuality](#). Scientists have determined that many dolphins are sexually attracted to humans; in this sense, human-dolphin love is reciprocal. If zoosexuality were accepted by society (and if it weren’t taboo), there would probably be many human-dolphin sexual relationships.

Remember that dolphins are known to have sex for **pleasure**, just like humans. Bonobo primates are also known to have sex for pleasure. Because of this, interspecies sex between a human and a dolphin (or interspecies sex between a human and a bonobo) could be mutually pleasurable for all involved. Just as dolphins have been observed having a sexual interest in humans, bonobos have also been observed having a sexual interest in humans.

Dolphins are not the only animals that seem to have sexual interest in other species; apparently, a man was minding his own business when a goat initiated sexual contact with him; the human wasn’t pleased, but the goat was. It is accounts like these ones (and apparently there are a lot of them) that suggest that perhaps interspecies sex may somehow benefit animals in some way; it also suggests that animals may actually **enjoy** interspecies sex.

If an animal makes it clear that it wants a sexual interaction with a human, then it would fall under the definition of consent because it would be “agreeing” or “permitting”. (For example, if a human is down on his/her knees in a doggy-style position and an animal penetrates him/her). Obviously, if a human forces an animal to have sex against the animal’s will, that would be considered rape, just as it would in a human-human interaction. But if an animal forces a human to have sex with it, then is that also considered “rape”?

The concept of an animal deliberately initiating sexual contact with a human is known as “**reverse bestiality**”, and it is actually more common than one might think. Apparently, to many animals in the Animal Kingdom (such as dolphins), humans are sexy creatures, and animals such as dolphins have an urge to have sex with what they perceive to be sexy creatures (humans). Studies have shown that some dolphins are sexually attracted to humans. The issue of “reverse bestiality” is an issue that is usually ignored by the anti-zoosexuals, because it contradicts many of their arguments. In the case of reverse bestiality and ethical zoosexual activity, there are two principles which come into play: **utilitarianism** and the **harm principle**. The term **utilitarianism** means:

“The ethical doctrine that virtue is based on utility, and that conduct should be directed towards the greatest happiness of the greatest number of individuals”

and the harm principle is:

“A principle that holds that the actions of individuals should only be limited to prevent harm to other individuals.”

Based on these principles, it is easy to understand why most zoosexual acts **are ethical**. If no one is suffering, and if both parties (the human and the animal) are enjoying the sex, then who is being harmed? No one. And as far as “consent” is concerned, the argument that animals cannot “consent” to sex is a weak argument because non-human animals have sex with each other all the time in the wild without ever uttering a human word. There is also evidence that (at least when it comes to sex) the intrinsic consciousness that non-human animals have is similar to that of humans; in both humans and non-human animals, sex is pleasurable (and remember that there is no moral attachment to sex in non-human animals; for example, dolphins rape each other all the time in the wild).

SECTION 8: MORE ON “CONSENT”: PEOPLE ARE EXTREMELY HYPOCRITICAL WITH REGARD TO “CONSENT”

In section 6, I discussed why lack of “consent” cannot be used as a legitimate argument against zoosexuality. In this section, I will address other flaws with the “consent” argument.

There is something very ironic about zoosexuality, especially concerning consent. If a person eats an animal, such as a chicken nugget or a hamburger, then did that animal “consent” for you to eat it? Of course not; yet it is acceptable by society. More than 90% of the world population eats meat, yet it is estimated that the number of zoosexuals is quite small. This brings up an interesting point; does eating a chicken nugget mean you are having non-consensual oral sex with an animal? Why are people criticized for having sex with animals, but not criticized for eating them? I bet that many of the animal rights activists who condemn zoosexuality eat meat regularly without even thinking about it. Having sex with an animal **can** involve consent, whereas slaughtering an animal and eating its meat **does not** involve the animal’s consent. The same can be said for hunting.

I find it strange that people can condemn an issue like zoosexuality while at the same time eat animals that have been slaughtered in a factory; this seems hypocritical to me. It would seem that this apparent hypocrisy is the result of two social norms which have collided with each other: the social norm of eating meat (from a biological perspective, gaining protein) and the social norm of sticking to the human species when it comes to relationships. This mix would seem to indicate that both results of the two outcomes (eating meat and staying within our species) results in more offspring. So ultimately, it may be the subconscious urge to propagate our species which is the driving force behind the apparent hypocrisy of eating meat yet condemning zoosexuality. (When you think about it, though, what would an animal prefer: to be killed and eaten, or to have sex?)

Just remember: when cows are slaughtered and turned into a hamburger, did those cows **consent** to be killed? **Of course not.**

Here is a quote which reflects this hypocrisy:

*“At first I went for the obvious ‘the animal can’t give consent’ argument, but in retrospect it is an incredibly weak and absurd argument. We generally don’t **treat** animals as conscious beings – we treat them as resources and as such, we almost never delegate human morals and rights onto animals which is why, in the grand majority of cases, we don’t care about consent.*

Anything which we use animals for [i.e. animal exploitation] – whether it be food, entertainment or medical tests – we don’t ask for their consent. We don’t care. When we forcefully breed two horses or when we forcefully jam a pipe in into a mare’s womb to forcefully inseminate it – we again don’t care what they think or whether they give consent to it. We treat them as property. A dog [or a pig] has as much say in whether he is eaten or whether he wants to take a walk.

Basically, when someone gives me the consent argument, I honestly doubt he goes home and hopes that the steak he's about to eat came from a consenting animal.” — al4674,
www.escapistmagazine.com/forums/read/528.386959-In-this-day-and-age-why-is-bestiality-still-illegal-or-even-immoral

It is important to remember that good zoosexual people **understand** that an animal has a right to consent or not consent (by using signals and body language). Zoosexuals understand that animals are sentient and conscious beings just like humans. Zoosexuals also have compassion and respect for animals and understand that non-human animals have **rights** just like humans. However, slaughterhouse people **do not care** about the animal's consent and **do not care** about the animal's rights; they slaughter animals to exploit them for financial gains (to them, animals are only objects which can be exploited). While zoosexuals genuinely respect the rights of animals and love animals, people who slaughter animals have **no respect** for animals. Ultimately, having sex with an animal can be ethical (and usually is ethical), whereas slaughtering an animal and creating a premature death for an animal is **never** ethical. (Unfortunately, most people are too ignorant to realize this; they support the slaughterers by eating their meat and condemn the zoosexuals for no rational reason). Most non-zoosexual people are **selfish** and only care about what benefits themselves; they eat meat in order to take nutrients from animals and make themselves stronger, and they condemn bestiality because it doesn't benefit them or directly impact them (so this enables them to criticize it as much as they want). Also, society has brainwashed them into hating it.



Above: animals do not consent to be slaughtered and used as meat for selfish human purposes.

I am often amazed at people's **failure** to understand the hypocrisy of eat meat while simultaneously condemning bestiality. Maybe they're not intelligent enough to understand it. The typical response to the "meat hypocrisy" from the average person generally sounds like this:

“you’re supposed to kill and eat animals, and you’re *not* supposed to have sex with them” (along with the usual array of ignorant, hateful words like “sick”, “depraved”, “disgusting” etc.) They often argue that eating meat is “natural” while bestiality isn’t (which, as already discussed, is completely incorrect; lions eating meat in the wild is natural, but the way humans slaughter animals on such a massive scale is NOT natural; in addition, don’t forget the fact that interspecies sex is natural). What the ignorant “zoo-haters” fail to realize is that it is **completely hypocritical** to condemn bestiality for lack of “consent” while at the same time eating the meat of animals who obviously never consented to be slaughtered. In addition, they fail to realize that the amount of pain and suffering required to create a hamburger is **far greater** than the “pain” and “suffering” caused by bestiality (and usually **there is no** pain and suffering involved in bestiality). Here is a quote regarding this issue (about a report of a “molested” dog); the following quote is a response to an ignorant anti-zoophile:

“You [an anti-zoophile] missed his point, the point was you can’t have it both ways with an abuse/cruelty definition. First of all the dog [which the man had sex with] was uninjured, they found no injuries at all and she was well cared for. Secondly, if you define this act (bestiality) as automatic abuse then you MUST define eating meat, eggs, milk and cheese as exactly the same since all of those items always result in pain, discomfort and death of the animals involved. Those who sit there eating a ham sandwich or eggs with sausage while screaming ‘abuse!!! abuse!!!’ [against the zoophile] in the defendant’s case here are blind hypocrites. Any expose’ video on youtube showing what goes on every day in factory farms, slaughterhouses and meat packing plants will prove that tens of thousands of animals a day die horrible deaths after horrible lives jammed into cages due to the want for max profits.[...]”

Cattle are dehorned and castrated and other surgery done on them with no anesthesia, rodeo horses are beaten, kicked and given electric shocks to make them “buck”, the list goes on and all of that is LEGAL! [And it shouldn't be legal] [...]

Bestiality PALES in comparison [to slaughter]! you should be reserving all this anger, outrage and hate for livestock ranchers and slaughterhouses [instead of aiming it at zoophiles], and put them [the slaughterhouses] all out of business if you **REALLY** care about stopping animal abuse as you claim!” — Furry2, <http://www.nola.com/crime/index....>

Here is a quote which relates to the above point:

“While I figured the consent argument would come up more, people are more subscribed to the position that sex with animals is harmful to animals. First of all, how is it harmful? Is it more harmful that forcefully inseminating a female horse to act as a live breeding machine, which as a practice is ultra-common? We’re basically raping them already.

But even if I grant you that it is harmful – why should we care? Considering how we systematically kill and torture animals for the sake of our comfort, pleasure and lifestyle – it would be outright hypocritical to utter any condemning remark against zoophiles.

*Having sex with an animal is detrimental to the animal? So? Being suspended in a factory in a certain position for 6 months to ensure maximum production of meat is **far more** detrimental to the animal [than having sex with it]. How about medical tests? How about forcefully training a bear to ride a bike? I mean, of all the things you can object to – you object to the one that is*

arguably one of the least harmful things that can happen to an animal [having sex with it].

All of these things are done to give us and preserve pleasure. We exploit, kill and torture animals anyway and we don't care. If there's a meat factory next to our houses, we don't care about the systematic torture and death that happens there. Why would we then care what some guy and his horse do on his ranch?" — al4674, <http://www.escapistmagazine.com/...>

And below is a quote by a meat-eater who acknowledges his unethical-ness and hypocrisy:
"Because [sex with sheep] is not OK, is it? And yet eating them is. And what I cannot figure out, try as I might, is why one [eating meat] should be so permissible as to be unremarkable, and the other [sex with animals] not permissible at all.

It doesn't have to be sheep. By the time you read this, many, many animals will have been festively and delightfully consumed. Here and across the world, and many of them by me. From the annual American Thanksgiving turkey genocide (45 million, they say, each November) to the endless rollcall of cows, pigs, chickens and everything else slaughtered thereafter. Gutted, stuffed, dressed, roasted, gnawed, binned. Imagine them all, rising up now, as a farmyard zombie horde, dragging themselves limblessly, or at least meatlessly, out of landfill. Reforming themselves like Ted Hughes's Iron Man, perhaps, out of a thousand discarded sandwiches. And imagine their bleats, gobbles and moos could coalesce into intelligible noise. What would they be saying? [Would they say] "Aaat leeeast you didn't shaaag me instead..." — No, [they wouldn't say that]. [...]

What I would like us to do, though, is be more aware of the generally utilitarian nature of our ethics. We eat them because we want to, and we figure out the morality afterwards as best we can. If indeed we even do. To be honest, increasingly I don't. [...] Is this dreadful hypocrisy? I think it is. I have killed animals, after all. [...] [I unethically exploit and kill animals] and I suspend any sort of guilt about this, moreover, because I can, and because succumbing to it would just be so damn inconvenient." — H.R., <http://www.spectator.co.uk/colum...>

The above quote reminds us that people do things that are far worse to animals than having sex with them — and yet those activities (such as killing them and eating them) are legal — why? Ultimately, ethical zoosexual acts should **not** be prohibited by law, and acts which **are** detrimental to animal's welfare (such as killing them) should be **banned**. Yet the opposite of this is true in many places (which is irrational, unethical and hypocritical). In fact, in Indiana ethically having sex with an animal is a felony but torturing and killing an animal in a decompression chamber is only a misdemeanor. I think that says something about how completely f**ked up our legal system is.

Anti-zoosexual people will often counter-argue that killing animals and eating their meat is "natural" and "necessary" to human survival. This is **not true**; there are plenty of vegetarian people who live healthy lives without ever eating meat — and their lifespans are pretty long. And it is absurd to claim that massive industrialized slaughterhouses are "natural". Even if eating meat is intrinsically "natural", that alone does not justify doing it — and it certainly doesn't make it "better" than having sex with an animal.

The following quote comes from another source addressing this issue:

“If it was legal to have sex with animals, I would choose not to, but as a truth seeker I have to ask: Why aren’t people allowed to have sex with animals? Typically, people think it’s illegal because it’s a horrible thing to do or because it harms animals that obviously can’t give consent. If you think that bestiality should be illegal because it’s disgusting, then why would you support free speech or freedom of religion? I could say things that would disgust you or practice a faith that might disgust you, yet most of you would probably not try to forcibly prevent me from speaking or worshipping however I wish. We tolerate speech that disgusts us because we know that we are morally fallible and that it doesn’t hurt anyone[...] Because we recognize that we [humans] are all flawed and all capable of error, we allow people to do and say whatever they want so long as it does not harm others. What makes bestiality any different?”

The single limitation on freedom – the ‘so long as it does not harm others’ part – leads into the second possible justification for bestiality being illegal: It harms animals, but they can’t consent to it. This statement is inconsistent with United States law and most of our lifestyles. Can animals’ consent to being owned? Can animals’ consent to being slaughtered? Do those actions not harm them? If animals deserve protection from the harm of humans, then we would have to make it illegal to consume any animal product or own a pet or go hunting. Animals can’t give consent to these activities, and yet all of them are harmful[...]

It’s uncomfortable to be faced with this hypocrisy in the law, but legalizing bestiality shouldn’t be scary. History has shown us that alcohol prohibition didn’t stop people drinking, that censorship doesn’t stop people from speaking out, and that banning prostitution and pornography doesn’t prevent people from finding pornographic material or prostitutes in a black market. Banning things does not prevent them from happening; it only punishes people for their choices. Making bestiality legal probably won’t cause people to suddenly start having sex with animals, because those who feel the urge and need to do that probably already do. So who benefits from keeping it illegal? No one, really. And the amount of benefit animals receive from bestiality being illegal is almost negligible in comparison.

Animal husbandry, hunting, slaughterhouse factories, animal pageants and pet shows, dog fighting, bestiality[...] I charge that anyone who would ban [bestiality] without banning [slaughterhouses, hunting, etc.] is being inconsistent and hypocritical. Hypocrisy in the law cannot be tolerated, regardless of how relevant that law is to our lives.”– Lucas Wachob,
<http://www.breezejmu.org/opinion...>

Things humans do to animals without informed consent:

- ☒ Spaying/neutering
- ☒ Claim them as property
- ☒ Ear cropping/declawing/tail docking
- ☒ Killing them for fur
- ☒ Eating them
- ☒ Killing them for sport
- ☒ Forcibly having them bred
- ☒ putting them in clothes
- ☒ Cut their fur
- ☒ Medical experimentation
- ☒ Using them as test subjects
- ☒ Euthenize them
- ☒ Film and photograph them
- ☒ Make them perform tricks for our entertainment
- ☒ Use them as slaves to do dangerous work

Above: Image depicts a list of unethical things people do to animals without their “informed consent”; remember that most of the practices on this list are far more unethical than zoosexuality

Below is a quote from <http://Debate.com> emphasizing the logical fallacies of “consent”:
“I am fully aware that the idea of “informed consent” in legal circles is different and much stricter. I do not mean legal/informed consent when I say consent. No one who has a pet, no one who has partook in any animal derived products has ever had informed consent from any animals. It is an impossibility even for humans to give perfect informed consent because it presupposes that both parties are perfectly aware of the consequences of an action. Something that requires the ability to predict the future with 100% certainty.

In practice what is meant by “informed consent” is that one party discloses any information about the interaction which may reasonably be expected to affect the other’s decision. If one party does not have the information, it cannot be given. If the other party is incapable of receiving the information, it is not considered a requirement. For instance, you bring an unconscious stranger into a hospital, the doctor will still treat them on the presumption that they want to be healed. This is implied consent but cannot be informed consent.

The point is that informed consent, while an objective standard, relies on the context of the typical human mind and language. It loses applicability beyond the scope of the human race, and attempting to apply it to morals involving non-humans leads to contradictions and absurdities.

*If in the “eyes of the law” no animal can ever consent, then no animal has ever consented to another animal. That means every single sexual encounter in the whole of history before mankind was in fact rape. I consider the above a valid form of **Reductio ad absurdum**[...] “Informed consent” is morally and legally inapplicable to [non-human] animals. [...]*

Why would humans be the only species capable of accepting interspecies sex? How can observed instances of interspecies sex between two non-human species be reconciled with [the notion that animals cannot “consent” to sex with beings outside of their species]? [...]

The relevant theory in the case of bestiality/zoophilia is mutual consent of interacting parties + reasonable avoidance of foreseeable pain or biological damage. No other moral standard shall be accepted.[...] The fact that law has traditionally defined “consent” in a manner that makes it impossible for animals to demonstrate it in court is irrelevant.[...]

Saying X should be legal/moral does not mean everything that belongs in that category is legal/moral; it means that something should not be illegal or immoral because it is X.[...] Therefore the [above] resolution does not mean that every act of bestiality is moral and should be legal, but that an act of bestiality is not immoral and should not be illegal solely because it is an act of bestiality.” — ADreamofLiberty, <http://www.debate.org/debates/Be...>

Also, consider what Brian Cuttridge has to say about this issue:
“Animals do not have legally recognized rights in our society[...] the manner in which animals are actually treated in our society demonstrates that such rights are not recognized either de facto or de jure. Addressing the purported purposes of anti-zoophilia statutes, Daniel writes, ‘as for only protecting animals because they cannot consent, the truth is that animals, particularly domestic ones, don’t consent to most of the things that happen to them.’ As detailed above,

animal sexual autonomy is regularly violated for human financial gain through procedures such as [artificial insemination]. Such procedures are probably more disturbing physically and psychologically than an act of zoophilia would be, yet the issue of consent on the part of the animal is never raised in the discussion of such procedures. To confine the 'right' of any animal strictly to acts of zoophilia is thus to make law [against zoophilia] based not on reason but on moral prejudice, and to breach the constitutional rights of zoophiles to due process and equality before the law.” —<http://www.inter-disciplinary.net...>

So ultimately, consider the fact that many of the things humans do to animals (like slaughtering them for meat, artificially inseminating them, neutering them, experimenting on them, hunting and killing them, etc) do **not** involve their consent, and yet they are largely accepted by society. Yet when it comes to sex, all of a sudden people say that consent matters. This is **extreme hypocrisy** because many of those same people support activities which do not involve the animal's consent (neutering, slaughtering, hunting, etc). And remember, the odds of an animal “consenting” to have sex with a human are **far greater** than an animal's “consent” to be artificially inseminated, slaughtered, killed, hunted, physically altered, or experimented on.

As I said earlier, it amazes me that so many people don't understand their own hypocrisy regarding their position on “consent”; they ignorantly say “eating something doesn't equal f**king something”. **But that's not the point.** People who disregard an animal's consent (in terms of slaughter, hunting, neutering, etc) but do NOT disregard an animal's consent with regard to sex (and demand that an animal “consent” only when sex is involved) are ignorant and hypocritical. They are subscribing to a fallacious double standard. People should NOT allow things that **really** violate an animals' consent (such as slaughter, hunting etc) and they **should** allow zoosexual acts because the probability of an animal consenting to have sex is far higher than the probability of it consenting to be slaughtered/hunted/neutered etc.

In addition to the “consent” issue, people should realize acts which really harm animals (such as slaughter, hunting, vivisection etc) are **far more unethical** than zoosexual acts because they cruelly destroy the lives of animals who have a **right** to live out their lives — and this destruction of animal's lives is done in order to exploit them for money and selfish human purposes. In contrast, zoosexual people place the animal's welfare above their own, treat animals as equal (to humans), and have compassion for them. Acts such as slaughter should be banned, and ethical zoosexual acts should **not** be banned. Remember, every year **billions and billions** of animals ruthlessly killed for arrogant, selfish humans — many of these animals are kept in cruel, hellish, agonizing conditions “behind closed doors” in massive factories before being slaughtered. Instead of prosecuting innocent zoosexual people, people **should** be prosecuting slaughterers and hunters (and people who actually harm animals). People should stop eating meat and start becoming **vegetarian or vegan**.

It should be pointed out that the term “informed consent” is a **red herring** (and a “smokescreen”) used by anti-zoosexual people all the time, even though most of those same anti-zoosexual people eat the meat of animals who never gave “informed consent” to be slaughtered, and keep pets the never gave “informed consent” to be spayed/neutered and kept confined in a home. The “informed consent” argument is illogical and is used as a “mask” by the anti-zoosexuals to hide their underlying prejudice towards bestiality.

Keep in mind that the “consent” argument used by anti-zoosexual people is a fallacy and a falsehood. For example, remember that gorillas can learn sign language — so if a gorilla knew sign language and told a human via sign language that he/she wanted to have sexual intercourse with that human, that would be unquestionable consent.

But this issue goes beyond just sign language. And as I said before, there are many instances in which it can be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that an animal is “consenting” to sex with a human (for example, if a woman is in a doggy-style position and a dog [with its own free will] penetrates her from behind). And also consider the fact that animals in the wild have sex with each other all the time **without ever speaking a human word**. When a lion in the wild has sex with another lion, the lions don’t think about “consent” — they just *have sex*. One lion does not say to the other lion, “can I have sex with you?” Thus, it is too anthropocentric (and irrational) for humans to “apply” and/or “expect” a non-human animal to “consent” to sex. With regard to sexual activity, “consent” is not a meaningful concept for non-human animals.

The quote below was made regarding interspecies sex in nature:

“What most people don’t understand is that animals simply look at it as sex. It’s not “dirty”, it’s not “rape”, it’s just what a male and a female do regardless. We human’s put all our own meanings onto something that to [non-human] animals is just sex. We [humans] have our own reasons for treating sex the way we do, but it only matters to us.” — JARM13,

<http://zetaliberation.deviantart...>

Essentially, consent takes many forms — verbal human communication is just one of method of expressing consent. The notion that a non-human animal must “consent” in a human-centric way is arrogant, speciesist and irrational.

And as already discussed, a non-human animal is far more likely to non-verbally “consent” to sex than it is to “consent” to acts which are far more harmful and detrimental to animals (such as slaughter, hunting, etc.) If a person is trying to have sex with a stallion and the stallion doesn’t like it, the stallion can seriously injure or even kill the human if it wanted to. A pig in a slaughterhouse has no such freedom — it cannot “decide” whether to be slaughtered. A person who slaughters a pig does not ask for the pig’s “consent” or “approval” when slaughtering it. This is one of the reasons why slaughter (and other acts which **really** harm animals) should be **banned**, and acts which do **not** harm animals (such as ethical zoosexual acts) should be **allowed**.

Before moving on to the next section, read this quote:

“An overly used argument against bestiality is consent, that animals cannot consent to it and therefore it should not be allowed. Well why do we not think of consent when we use animals for laboratory testing, artificial insemination, when we hunt them for sport, castrate and even slaughter them for animal meat? Some of these things are far more barbaric than intercourse. In fact, mere “trivialities” like locking up animals and leashing them — do we really believe animals consent to them? If these things were done to humans it would be labeled murder, kidnap, abuse, cannibalism, but when it comes to animals it’s simply a norm, a so called order of the day. And so don’t you think [applying] this issue of consent only when it comes to zoophilia is plainly hypocritical and solely based on prejudice than on morality?”

*Besides, I am talking about zoophilia and not zoosadism or anything of that sort, my attention drawn specifically to cases in which a human maintains **aromantic relationship with an animal**, in which he or she forms both **emotional and intimate attachments** to the animal and is **concerned about the animal's welfare**. It is no news that animals do enjoy these things. Some even initiate these intimate practices, sometimes signaled by the occasional hump on the human's back. Moreover, consent means to show **approval**, and what does willingness to engage in the act signal if not approval? Does it really have to be verbal?*

I even have a vague recollection of a psychologist who said she had conducted extensive research on the nervous system and found feelings of love and affection to be produced in a very primitive part of the brain, one very much present in animals. Hence it is not unreasonable to conclude that animals experience feelings of love, that they can focus all their intimate energy on one individual. In simpler terms, she claims it is possible for animals to fall in love. And in the case of zoophilia, well, even with a human being. [Humans are animals too]

*We should also not be quick to forget the golden rule, that **one should treat others as one would like others to treat oneself**. [So] I ask, is it not fair to allow people freely express themselves like we ourselves do? Psychopathy and paraphilic disorders are limited to cases in which “**distress** is caused to the individual and harm done to others”. In cases of zoophilia, where nothing of that sort is accounted for, can we still say we have a right to call such people “sick” and stop them from being happy?” — “Nobody”, <http://www.nairaland.com/1277894...>*

SECTION 9: IRRATIONAL SPECIESISM

Earlier, I discussed the flawed belief held by many religions, especially monotheistic religions such as Christianity, which proclaims that humans are set “above” all other non-human animals. The reason this argument is **irrational** is because humans **are** animals. In fact, we share 98% of our DNA with Apes and we share 75% of our DNA with dogs. Many of the religious dogmas and doctrines were created thousands of years ago, long before the discovery of DNA and the scientific method. Back then, there were many things that were poorly understood and mysterious, but that is today well understood. Because of this, it is irrational for people to base their beliefs on archaic ideas of humans being “superior” to non-human animals. If humans are considered to be animals, then it would rationally follow that there would be nothing wrong with having sex with certain kinds of animals.

The idea that humans are “higher” than other animals are known as **speciesism**. Coined by Richard D. Ryder, it is [like] the terms “racism” and “sexism” and refers to a bias among humans towards the homo-sapien species over other species. The speciesism barrier may be the last barrier that humanity has yet to break. Speciesism explains why people eat other animals without their consent and yet condemn zoosexuality. It also seems to explain why throughout history humans have arrogantly thought of themselves as being “superior” over non-human animals, and why people focus on the best interests of humans, but not other animals. Perhaps this is why “environmentalism” as we know it has only developed quite recently (historically); for most of history, humans only saw animals for what they could provide for humans. If an ox could carry a load, it was good. If a goat could provide meat, it was good. But zoosexuality did not seem to serve a purpose because it did not result in any offspring.

The concept of “speciesism” is closely related to the “human exceptionalism” belief, and it is also related to **anthropocentrism** (also known as “human supremacy”), which is the arrogant belief that humans are the most significant things in the universe (which is completely false; after all, on a cosmic scale the Earth is equivalent to a grain of sand on a beach — a tiny speck of matter lost in the incomprehensibly vast universe. Humans are therefore trivial and insignificant, even though they *think* they’re important).

Speciesism, “human exceptionalism” and anthropocentrism are irrational, visceral, knee-jerk beliefs which are described in the following quote:

“[An argument for banning sex with animals] is that crossing the species barrier has been a sexual taboo in our country, at least publicly, for many years. Opponents of bestiality often describe themselves as advocates of ‘human exceptionalism’ and express the belief that intercourse with animals debases the dignity of human beings by blurring the lines between people and animals. They fail to explain why sex is unique in this matter — why playing Frisbee with a dog, or eating a corned beef sandwich does not also blur such boundaries[...] The burden should be placed upon the prohibitionists to explain why a small minority of individuals with non-mainstream sexual interests pose a threat to our overall societal welfare. [Kinsey’s research suggests that] there are a considerable number of zoophiles. Needless to say, public animosity — and criminal statutes — likely keep them in the shadows[...] The test of a truly enlightened civilization is one that lets people alone, to pursue their own predilections, even when the majority of us prefer to live our lives differently.” — <http://www.opposingviews.com/i/t...>

People who are **speciesist** often erroneously believe that human like is more “valuable” than non-human life. **This is not true.** A human’s life is just as “valuable” as a dog’s life; **ALL** life is valuable. This concept only applies to “higher-order” creatures (such as humans, dogs, cats, elephants, dolphins, bonobos, gorillas, lions, birds, reptiles, sharks, fish, etc) and not to things like bacteria or viruses. So, in general, the value of a human’s life ought to be considered as the **same** value as that of an elephant or dog (this is something that speciesists do not believe in). Speciesists tend to ignore the fact that humans **are** animals. Unfortunately, the arrogant beliefs of speciesists have been embedded into the law in many places (and so the punishment for killing a human is far more severe than killing a dog because human life is thought of as more “valuable”, even though it isn’t. The punishment for *any* killing, whether it is a human, dog, elephant, etc., should be severe [but this is not reflected in speciesist laws]).

In any case, philosopher Peter Singer is a well-known for criticizing speciesism and has argued that human sexual relations with animals **can be acceptable** so long as the animal isn’t harmed; here is a quote by him:

“Heard anyone chatting at parties lately about how good it is having sex with dogs? Probably not. Sex with animals is definitely still taboo[...] The existence of sexual contact between humans and animals, and the potency of the taboo against it, displays the ambivalence of our relationship with animals. On the one hand, especially in the Judeo-Christian tradition — less so in the East — we have always seen ourselves as distinct from animals, and imagined that a wide, unbridgeable gulf separates us from them. [According to religions], humans alone are made in

*the image of God. Only human beings have an immortal soul. In Genesis, God gives humans dominion over the animals. In the Renaissance idea of the Great Chain of Being, humans are halfway between the beasts and the angels. We are spiritual beings as well as physical beings. For Kant, humans have an inherent dignity that makes them ends in themselves, whereas animals are mere means to our ends. Today the language of human rights — rights that we attribute to all human beings but deny to all nonhuman animals — maintains this separation.[...] The taboo on sex with animals may, as I have already suggested, have originated as part of a broader rejection of non-reproductive sex. But the vehemence with which this prohibition continues to be held, its persistence while other non-reproductive sexual acts have become acceptable, suggests that there is another powerful force at work: our desire to differentiate ourselves, erotically and in every other way, from animals.[...] Sex with animals does not always involve cruelty. Who has not been at a social occasion disrupted by the household dog gripping the legs of a visitor and vigorously rubbing its penis against them? The host usually discourages such activities, but in private not everyone objects to being used by her or his dog in this way, and occasionally mutually satisfying activities may develop.” — Peter Singer, *Heavy Petting**

Of course, due to the taboo nature of zoosexuality and social stigma surrounding it, if anyone seems to advocate it, they are instantly criticized; which is what happened to Peter Singer. However, despite being criticized, Peter Singer does bring up the point that humans should not be so “human-centric”; this concept is part of a greater concept known as the “animal liberation” movement, and zoosexuality has been seen as part of that movement (assuming that the zoosexuality goes along with Peter Singer’s idea of a “mutually beneficial” relationship between humans and animals).



Above: animated GIF image; the label of “species” is a human-invented construction (an artificial construct); It only describes and classifies individuals in terms of whether they are different or similar. Beings should not be discriminated against based on what species they belong to

Here is an example of speciesism being counteracted:

[Question: "Do you think that having/wanting to have "regular" sex (human to human), or even being attracted to humans as well as animals makes you less of a [zoosexual person]?" — Sweetallis]

[Response to question by Zqwm7:] “A person that has zoosexual feelings but also feelings for humans is not “less zoosexual” because humans ARE animals. Thus, anyone who has feelings for humans is technically a zoosexual, though most people don’t think of it this way.

If one thinks in a less anthropocentric way, one can see that humans really aren't that different from other animals. For example, if a person is sexually attracted to horses, dogs, humans, pigs and goats, it is important to understand that (from that person's perspective) humans are one of the animal species that that person is attracted to. Thus, it does not mean that the person is "less zoo".

The only reason terms like "zoosexuality" have arisen (to specifically refer to non-human animals) is because our society is so hostile and intolerant of any interspecies relations between humans and other species. But ultimately, if one realizes that humans are themselves an animal species, then it should be understood that a person who is attracted to multiple species (which may or may not include humans) is not any more or less "zoo" than a person who happens to be more attracted to horses than dogs.

The flawed philosophical platform called "human exceptionalism" is the arrogant, irrational and delusional belief that humans are "superior" to (and separate from) other animals. True zoos [zoosexual people] should despise this belief." — <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>
The above quote reminds us that some zoosexual people are attracted only to non-human animals and that some zoosexual people are attracted to non-human animals AND humans — but remember that because humans ARE animals, a person who is attracted to dogs and humans is just as "zoosexual" as a person who is attracted to dogs and elephants (all of them are animals).

SECTION 10: ZOOSEXUALITY, ETHICS, AND THE NONEXISTENT PEDO CONNECTION

Zoosexuality **does not** count as "animal cruelty". A small minority of zoosexuals are "zoosadists" with the intent to harm the animal, but the rest (the majority) have **no intention** of hurting the animal. Also, animal cruelty in the form of butchering animals for human consumption goes unchecked on a massive scale every day and yet it is not condemned (at least in a taboo-ish way) the way zoosexuality is. The important thing to remember is that animals can "consent" to sex by displaying certain non-verbal behaviors.

Those against zoosexuality often argue that sex with animals automatically harms the animal based on physiology. When people make this claim, they are usually referring to all animals; however, they are **incorrect**. Certain species **are capable** of having sex with humans, and certain species are not (based on their [size compatibility](#)). It is logical that forcing an animal physically incapable of having sex with a human to have sex with a human is an act of zoosadism. However, there is **nothing unethical** about humans who have sex with large dogs, horses, goats, dolphins, and other creatures that are large enough to be physically compatible with humans. Because large animals are unlikely to be injured or harmed by having sex with a human, such relations **are ethical**. Zoosexuality has never been officially acceptable anywhere, and thus no rules were ever set in place to determine which species were capable of having sex with humans and which weren't. According to the Internet, the most common animals involved in zoosexual activity are large dogs, horses, donkeys, goats, and pigs, to name a few. Based solely on this information, it would be rational to conclude that humans **are capable** of having sex with a few species, and that such interactions are ethical. Hopefully, society will realize that some forms of

zoosexual activity (i.e. with large animals) are ethical and that some forms of zoosexual activity (i.e. with small animals) are not ethical. In any case, the argument that animals are incapable of sexual activity due to physiology is not a good argument because it is validated by certain species, yet doesn't work with others.

Another argument against zoosexuality is the claim that zoosexuality is linked to pedophilia – a claim that is **false**. This claim is made by Rep Nan Rich of Florida, who has tried to make sex with animals illegal in Florida numerous times. Here is a quote from [Broward Palm Beach New Times | The Leading Independent News Source in Broward-Palm Beach, Florida](#):

“Senator Rich’s press secretary, when asked to supply the scientific evidence backing her claims in the media about the connections between sex with animals and pedophilia, furnished a list of researchers, including Christopher Hensley, a professor at the University of Tennessee-Chattanooga. But like those cited by Unti, Hensley’s studies treat all human sex with animals as rape, based on the assumption that an animal cannot consent. However, his study was confined to prison inmates — an unusually violent demographic. [...]

When told of Senator Rich’s remarks about people who commit bestiality being a threat to children, Miletski [a researcher] says, ‘I think it’s real bullshit for people to say that. There’s no connection that we know of. If you said that to Zoos (zoosexuals), they would be so offended.’ That’s because Miletski says nearly all the zoophiles she interviewed expressed moral revulsion towards animals that had not fully matured. In this respect, she says, they recognize the same values that underlie laws against statutory rape. Miletski and a researcher based in Germany, Andrea Beetz, who conducted a similar large survey, argue that zoophiles are distinguished by their emotional relationship to the animals they love. Because they care for them, they would never consciously inflict pain upon them, even for their own pleasure. ”–[Broward Palm Beach bestiality article \(page 2\)](#) and [Broward Palm Beach bestiality article \(page 4\)](#)

In an article published in 2013 entitled “*Understanding zoosexuality: Prevalence, Impact, and Links to Criminal Behavior*”, the author of the blatantly anti-zoosexual article denigrates zoosexual people and makes slanderous and unfounded claims that zoosexual people are more “likely” to be violent and abuse children, even though her “sample” disproportionately represents only a few zoosadists — the sample is erroneous and does not reflect the silent majority of zoosexual people (AKA the ethical majority). The author treats her dubious “sample” as “fact” and then makes the erroneous and fallacious claim that there is a “link” between zoosexual people and unrelated crimes (she completely ignores the fact that correlation **does not** equal causation).

It is worth noting that the author of the above mentioned article is **Jenny Edwards**, a known anti-zoosexual bigot with a hateful and intolerant anti-zoosexual agenda. She is the founder of “Chandler Edwards”, an anti-zoosexual organization whose sole purpose is to bully zoosexual people. The Chandler Edwards group is an anti-zoosexual hate group which is masquerading as a legitimate “do-good” group. The organization has the **appearance** of being legit, but it is **not** (it pretends to be a “do-good” organization, and while doing this it simultaneously has an insidious mission to ruin the lives of zoosexual people and their animal lovers). Also, the Chandler Edwards group manufactures anti-zoosexual propaganda (such as the above-mentioned article) in order to satisfy (and “justify”) the anti-zoosexual prejudices of other anti-zoo haters. Jenny Edwards is on an irrational crusade to condemn zoosexuality through whatever means. Her

writings are tainted by her anti-zoosexual bias. She is known in the online zoosexual community as a fear-mongering zoophobic bigot. (See [this link](#)” and [this link](#)” for information on how she and others have discriminated against zoosexual people). Here are quotes regarding her discriminatory article:

“I find the article appalling and offensive. It is clear that [she] has an anti-zoosexual agenda and had an anti-zoosexual prejudice before she even began writing it. In other words, she is creating academic documents which support the bigoted belief that all zoosexual acts should be criminalized (this is appalling). The author is attempting to slander zoosexuals and denigrate them by associating them with bad things (such as violence, etc.)

I am also angered by the fact that this person claims there are “links” between zoosexual acts and unethical unrelated crimes such as violence. They are lies and deceptions created in order to denigrate zoosexuals and justify their hatred and intolerance of them. They don’t really care about the animal’s welfare — all they care about is criminalizing zoosexuality because of their irrational prejudices and speciesism. [If they really cared about animal welfare, they would be vegetarian and stop using animal products, and they don’t do that].” — Zqwm7

*“[Jenny Edwards] strikes me as another prude who thinks she knows how to run people’s lives better than they do. As long as no one else is getting hurt **who the hell cares????!!!!???** What happens in my bed or barn is between me and my consenting [non-human] partner. This is the same type of person who pushed for prohibition and the war on drugs. And look how f**king well that turned out.*

Anti-zoo’s with accredited academic backing pose a stronger threat than Joe Six-Pack purely because more people in power are willing to listen them based on that academic backing.

*Also her entire premise is bullshit. Correlation does not equal causation. Any halfway decent **real** scientist can tell you that. [...]“ — 421equinophilo421*

*“[The statistic missing from her study] are people [such as ethical zoosexual people]. The man or woman who lives in complete peace with the animal mate of their life. The mate who brings them happiness to them and they to them. [These people are not accounted for in her study]. They **are not** criminals, they are conscientious objectors to the law.*

Academics can help to show that some humans throughout history have had an affinity for animals. Where [people such as Jenny Edwards fail] is that having an affection for an animal doesn’t mean they [abuse] children. What they need to understand is someone like me finds [non-human] animals more attractive than my own species, [and finds mature animals attractive].” — Beastlover888

(above three quotes source: <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>)

It is worth noting that the “silent majority” of zoosexual people are people such as those on [Zoophilia and Bestiality Community](#) who ethically have sex with animals but are too fearful to reveal it to anyone (they hide in the closet to avoid being prosecuted by unjust and discriminatory laws) — because they hide, they remain invisible (while the few zoosadists who

are caught and exposed leave people with the erroneous and incorrect perception that ALL zoosexuals are like that, since those zoosadists are the only one they hear about — this often causes people to create unfair anti-zoosexual laws). Hence, flawed and inaccurate studies such as those of Christopher Hensley and Jenny Edwards (ignorant anti-zoosexual bigots).

Based on this information, it would appear that there is a pre-determined bias by people to automatically consider zoosexuality to be wrong. In sociology, one of the goals is to get a good sampling of people. It is clear that in this case (the first paragraph in the above quote), a good sample was not obtained because the sample was only of prison inmates; a better sample would've involved a more diverse sampling of different kinds of people. This is an example of how misconceptions about zoosexuality are spread – people interpret data incorrectly, and then that misinterpretation is repeated on the Internet as fact (even though it isn't true) and eventually the mainstream public accepts it as fact even though it isn't.

If an alien from another planet wanted to find out what the human species was like and only observed prisoners and inmates, those aliens would leave Earth with a pretty grim image of humans. Likewise, making the claim that zoosexuals are likely to be child abusers based on prisoner data seems flawed. After reading the <http://www.browardpalmbeach.com> article (see link at bottom) and Scientific Article (see link at bottom), I've come to the conclusion that **zoosexuals have no connection with pedophiles**; the only reason people think there is a connection is because of ignorance, rumors, misinterpreted data, and misconceptions spread by the media. (For more information, see [this link](#).) Additionally, as the above quote demonstrates, zoosexuality involves **mature animals**. For example, according to [Convert just about anything to anything else](#), a dog that is 10 years old is equivalent to a 53-year-old human. In contrast to this, pedophilia involves immature humans, which is why it should always be illegal.

Read this quote:

“There is a pro-active movement going on among the anti-bestiality crusaders to deliberately confuse bestiality with child abuse. There is also a growing fantasy that zoophiles ‘all know each other’ and form some kind of hidden secret society where we go around raping and molesting each other’s’ ‘poor innocent animals.’

These vigilantes are fond of quoting the flawed studies that purport to show that a majority of sex offenders started out abusing animals. The flaw most often pointed out is that the studies begin with criminals, not a random sampling of the general population. We don't honestly know what percentage of a random sample of people who have sex with non-human partners would end up becoming sexual predators, but I suspect it wouldn't be any different than the population at large.” — <http://blog.wetgoddess.net/?p=659>

In any case, it is **not logical** and **not rational** to lump zoosexuals together with people who abuse minors; it is along the same lines as lumping “caring” zoosexuals with zoosadists. Likewise, it isn't fair to lump respectable married humans into the same category as rapists.

Essentially, the belief that zoosexuals are “linked” to pedophiles is a **delusional fallacy** and is **incorrect**. Most people who are sexually attracted to animals are attracted to **mature** animals (the word “animal” includes both humans and non-humans). In other words, the vast majority of zoosexuals are attracted to **mature** animals (animals who have reached adulthood). In this sense, zoosexuals have the same aversion to pedo-oriented sexuality that most people have. When people bring up the (non-existent) pedo “link”, it is highly offensive to most zoosexuals.

Here is a quote regarding the unfair attitudes people have towards zoosexuality:

“Some people can be zoophobic much like some people are homophobic. This attitude is based on subjectivism and emotivism – subjective and emotional feelings – not on rational consideration. Zoophiles, however, maintain that they have loving relationships with their partner animals and do not feel that what they do is immoral. Zoophiles insist that zoosexuality is no different from human-human relationships, can last years and go beyond bare sexuality. They claim that many animals of both sexes can experience pleasure from human-made sexual acts, can solicit sexual pleasure from humans and show their appreciation.

Most people would surely agree that it is immoral for self-interested sexual gratification to cause an animal distress or pain, impair a young animal’s development or coerce an adult animal into unwilling acts. But responsible zoophiles would surely care for their animal partners, who must be consenting, and insure the well-being of their animals’ partners as part of their love.” — Animal Rights Encyclopedia, <http://www.zoosavvy.com/zoophili...>

Some people try to link zoophiles with violence — this is bullsh*t. For example, read this quote: *“Prohibiting zoophilia on the basis that there **might** or somehow **should** be a casual correlation between zoophilia and interpersonal violence is unjust and violates the zoophiles’ rights to procedural due process. Even if there was a direct casual connection between zoophilia and interpersonal violence, it is extremely unlikely that the relationship would be so straightforward as to state that every zoophile is also an assaulter of humans. Prohibiting zoophilia on this basis amounts to social profiling based on sexual orientation. It assumes that all zoophiles are equally likely to commit violent crimes, and further amounts to mass detention inasmuch as it deprives them of an essential liberty (the right to engage in a private sexual activity) without first proving them guilty of the act (interpersonal violence) for which that liberty has been denied them. Such punishment is a violation of the rights of all zoophiles to due process and is a legally and morally inappropriate imposition of the state in the sphere of private affairs.”* —

<http://www.inter-disciplinary.ne...>

There is something that should be mentioned: it is called “**confirmation bias**”. Here is a definition of “confirmation bias” from a Wikipedia featured article:

“Confirmation bias is the tendency of people to favor information that confirms their beliefs or hypotheses. People display this bias when they gather or remember information selectively, or when they interpret it in a biased way. The effect is stronger for emotionally charged issues and for deeply entrenched beliefs. People also tend to interpret ambiguous evidence as supporting their existing position. Biased research, interpretation and memory have been invoked to explain attitude polarization, belief perseverance (when beliefs persist after the evidence for them is shown to be false), the irrational primacy effect (a greater reliance on information encountered

early in a series), and illusory correlation (when people falsely perceive an association between two events or situations).” — [Wikipedia: confirmation bias](#)

Earlier, I discussed Nan Rich, Dr. Hensley and Jenny Edwards — all of these people are tainted by **confirmation bias** in terms of their attitude towards zoosexuality. In other words, **before** they began researching, they had already decided that zoosexual acts researching, I”, and their “research” was done in order to support their pre-conceived (already existing) flawed beliefs — basically, an irrational prejudice. Their works are also tainted by “illusory correlation” in the sense that they attempt to **falsely** (erroneously) link and associate zoosexuality with unrelated subjects such as violence — they fail to realize that correlation does not equal causation. Their works also contain misuse of statistics (see Wikipedia article [“misuse of statistics”](#)).

Here is an example of a person (Dr. Mark Griffiths) displaying non-neutral confirmation bias while researching zoophilia:

“The author – a self-admitted [zoosexual person], makes observations (ones which I feel duty bound to point out that I don’t personally agree with)[...] As I wrote in a my previous blog on herpetophilia, the animals cannot give “informed consent”, so therefore such sexual activity is “morally wrong”” — Dr. Mark Griffiths

Remember that “informed consent” is a fallacy and is morally and legally **inapplicable** to non-human animals (they cannot give “informed consent” to *anything*); “informed consent” is a highly anthropocentric concept and trying to apply it to non-human animals is ludicrous. “Informed consent” should only be taken into consideration in human-to-human sexual relations. (Even in human-to-human sexual contact, “informed consent” is implied/assumed and not explicitly stated (usually)).

So essentially, Nan Rich, Dr. Hensley, Jenny Edwards (and Dr. Mark Griffiths) had already made up their minds (**prior** to doing their research) that zoosexuality is “wrong” and “abhorrent”, and thus their works are tainted by prejudicial confirmation bias — no matter how many rational arguments in favor of zoosexuality are presented to them, and no matter how much evidence is presented to them which proves that zoosexuality is NOT wrong, they will ignore these findings and choose only the “research” which confirms their anti-zoosexual bias. This has happened in courtrooms when zoosexuals have been on trial — even though the zoosexual person’s arguments (that zoosexuality is not intrinsically “wrong” and that he/she had ethical interspecies sex) are presented, the judge and jury had **already decided before** he/she entered the courtroom that zoosexuality is “wrong” and “immoral” — and so even the most compelling argument presented by the zoosexual person’s defense will probably be ignored by the judge and jury (source of this irrational attitude: confirmation bias).

Before beginning the next section, I want to briefly discuss spaying and neutering (castration), as it is related to animal sexuality. Spaying and neutering are unethical and should be banned, because they violate an animal’s sexual autonomy (and violate their right to have sex) more than zoosexual acts ever could. Zoosexual acts **do** involve non-verbal consent, whereas spaying and neutering **do not** involve the animal’s consent whatsoever. People often use the “overpopulation” argument to support spaying and neutering, but if this is the case then when aren’t humans spayed and neutered? After all, humans are excessively overpopulated all over the

Earth. The reason humans aren't spayed and neutered is because people are speciesist and arrogantly and irrationally place humans in a separate "category" from other animals (an artificial construction) — and they erroneously assign different "values" to non-human animals (i.e. speciesism). People also castrate animals purely due to selfish human conveniences. People claim that animals "don't have a sexual identity" [a speciesist human-centric way of thinking], and therefore it is OK to castrate them — but **that's not the point**. Even if a dog isn't *aware* of his/her lack of sexual functions, that doesn't mean it is right to deprive them of it, and that doesn't mean people should do it anyway. A fish may not be aware that it is swimming in water, but that does not make it any less important to the fish.

With regard to spaying and neutering, remember the golden rule — treat others the way you would want to be treated. If you are a man, you would not want your balls to be cut off, so why is it OK to cut off a cat or dog's balls? The answer is that it is not OK, and it is unethical; yet many people don't realize this. In 2005 due to the "Mr. Hands" incident in Washington state, a person died due to a careless accident, but the horses involved were **not harmed**. In fact, had the accident not occurred, the zoosexuals would've continued to ethically have sex with horse(s) with no problems. But once their activities were revealed to the public, a group of arrogant, bigoted and speciesist people with an anti-zoosexual prejudice seized the horse and **gelded** (castrated) it. Their reason for cruelly castrating the horse was to deliberately sabotage the horse so that zoosexual people wouldn't be able to have sex with him anymore. The people who castrated the horse claimed to be supporting "animal rights", but in fact they were doing the opposite: they deprived the horse of his right to have sex and experience sexual pleasure; they also interfered with the lives of good zoosexual people. These so-called "animal rights" people who gelded the horse were really wolf in sheep's clothing and had a malicious hatred and intolerance of zoosexual people. To them, sabotaging the lives of zoosexuals was more important than the horse's well-being. In addition, they ruined a horse's sexuality in order to satisfy their arrogant self-righteous delusions and anti-zoosexual agenda. Ultimately, the act of a horse having sexual intercourse with a human is **far more ethical** than gelding (castrating) a horse, because zoosexual sex is natural and **within** the horse's sexual experiences (and pleasurable for the horse), whereas gelding **destroys** the horse's ability to experience sex (which is wrong).

Laws which force animals in shelters to be spayed/neutered prior to being given to someone are completely unethical and should be repealed. At the very least, a person who wants to adopt an animal should be given a choice of whether they want their animal unaltered. Unfortunately, in some U.S. states, there is no choice (in some states an animal **MUST** be altered before being adopted, which is unethical and unfair to the animal). Remember that terms like "spaying", "neutering" and "altering" are also euphemisms for "castration" and "destroying an animal's sex organs".

SECTION 11: THE “POOR HEALTH” FALLACY / THE DIFFICULTY OF BEING ZOOSEXUAL

Another argument against zoosexuality is the argument that zoosexual activity results in poor health, perhaps initially brought on by the myth the bestiality AIDS myth. It is true that some STDs can be transmitted from an animal to a human and vice versa. But keep in mind that humans spread STDs to other humans all the time, and the same protection methods that humans use with each other (i.e. condoms) can also be used in human-animal interactions. It seems a bit unusual to say “human-human STDs should be prevented by wearing contraceptives, but human-animal STDs should be prevented by preventing the sex act altogether”. Sometimes, abstinence is offered as a way to prevent the spread of STDs in human-human contact, but it is not the only way. To summarize, the majority of people believe it is OK for two humans to have a choice of either a) abstaining from sex, b) having protected sex or c) having unprotected sex, but that same majority probably **also** believes that abstinence between a human and an animal is always the only option; the fact that options are offered for human-human relations but **not** for human-animal relations is an indicator of prejudicial beliefs and speciesism.

Here is a quote from <http://www.mindprod.com/humanrig...> relating to zoosexuality and health: *“Now that the planet is overpopulated, the taboo [of sex with animals] is obsolete. Condoms could prevent disease in the same way as with humans. The issue of informed consent still applies, though the notion of informed consent is a bit silly given that all animals manage to give or refuse it with body language.”* — <http://www.mindprod.com/humanrig...>

The above website ([Canadian Mind Products • mindprod.com](http://www.mindprod.com)) also says that there were three reasons why people **originally** (centuries ago) did not accept sex with animals: to stop the spread of diseases, to maximize procreation, and to assert human superiority. The above quote argues that now, these reasons are meaningless because of our advanced and technological 21st century society.

In 2011, a study made the claim that having sex with animals increased the chances of penile cancer in males; however, the sample used was flawed. Here is a quote regarding this issue: *“[Sallie Graves], a female member of Equality For All (a pro-zoophilia group), told The Huffington Post that the results of the [penile cancer] study should prompt people to take precautions, like using a condom, when having sex with animals, but she said it likely would not deter diehard zoophiles. ‘Expecting people who truly love animals to give up their sexuality and nature just because of some physical dangers would be as absurd as expecting gays to become straight because of AIDS,’ Sallie Graves wrote in an email. ‘They might become more cautious ... but they wouldn’t change their nature. A true zoophile can’t change their attraction and love just because of a higher or lower infection risk.’*

Graves also emphasized that E.F.A. sees inter-species sex as benign. She also notes that she’s against causing physical pain to animals and that those who insist sex with animals is inherently abusive are wrong. ‘How in the world can I be abusing my dog if I get on my hands and knees and he licks and humps me without me even having to ask for it?’ Graves wrote.” — <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/20...>

People who have sex with animals or who are thinking about having sex with animals should take the same precautions that “regular” sex participants use (i.e. condoms, safe sex, etc) in order to reduce the spread of diseases. And as I’ve said before, diseases and STDs are actually a larger concern with regard to *human-to-human* sex than they are with zoosexual sex. For example, a person cannot get HIV from a dog.

Also, remember that a male human cannot make a female non-human animal pregnant, and a male non-human animal cannot make a female human pregnant (it’s because different species have different numbers of chromosomes). So for example, a male dog cannot make a female human pregnant. The only way to create hybrid animal (such as a human-dog hybrid) is by creating one in a **laboratory** using genetic material; a laboratory hybrid could be created, but irrational speciesist people who are “disgusted” by it (and irrationally view humans as “separate” from other animals) have so far prevented it from happening. But luckily, human-animal “merging” are slowly occurring; for example, Chinese scientists have modified cows to produce human breast milk.

Aside from health, perhaps another reason why zoosexuality is considered to be taboo is because of zoophiles themselves. Here is a quote by a zoophile (zoosexual) describing his anguish caused by not being accepted:

“I am one of a group of people (much larger than most people think) all over the world, who are attracted to animals both physically and emotionally. I am a zoosexual. I was born this way and have had this attraction as far back as I can remember. These last 10 years, the Internet has brought others like me together, that is to know that we are not alone. This has also opened the door for a lot of negative, very bad laws that punish us for just being who and what we are[...] The selective breeding process that is done, (and accepted) is in my opinion closer [to] rape than anything. In some cases, the animals do enjoy the event, but in most cases the female is tied, and shackled, while the male completes the breeding.

I have been active with horses, as long as I can remember. I was deeply in-love with a mare for 10 years before her death 6 years ago. I still love her and feel like I lost a wife. I am attracted to both males and females. I have never abused an animal in my life. The act of being intimate with them, is done with respect and tenderness with the feelings of love for my partner. This is the very same thing that is involved with human to human intimacy. My mate is not tied or held down and participates freely with consent (by her actions not words). I can’t help my feelings, and when I get around horses, dogs, and cows, I am very much aroused, and that makes them aroused as well. It is not uncommon for these animals to start to give me all the signals, and in some cases initiate the encounter. They are very sensitive to feelings, and pheromones as well, so without any stimulation, they can get quite proactive. I can show affection to a mare, some kisses and closeness, and she can respond with the desire to be intimate on the spot. Quite often it can become embarrassing. But that of course shows that they have no shame or do not think anything is wrong. What we do in our private life in our bedrooms and barns is our business. What I am trying to explain here is that the general person out there regards us as animal abusers, yet we are quite the opposite. We come from all walks of life; we are all normal people with a different sexual orientation that’s all! It hurts me deeply to be an honest, law abiding, respectful, caring person, and be thought of as a criminal just for being a little different[...]

If no harm is done, and both are happy, then they should leave us alone. I have to ask... why is it OK to kill an animal, and sell its parts to the public for food, but if we make that animal feel good sexually, then we are put in jail for 'animal abuse'. [People] talk about consent... where is the consent from the animal to say 'yeah, it's OK to brutally slaughter me after a few months of my life.' It is clearly a double standard. I hope this changes in my lifetime[...] we [zoosexuals] are still thought of as sick perverts, and criminals. It hurts.” — Brian Stevens, <http://mwillett.org/mind/animal-...>

Facebook groups dealing with homosexuality typically remain, while groups dealing with zoosexuality tend to always remain small because they are constantly being deleted by the Facebook authorities; this would seem to indicate a bias of one orientation over another, and this bias (I'm assuming) is probably felt in places other than Facebook. Because of this, zoophiles are probably in their own “closet”, similar to the “closet” of homosexuality. Part of the reason for this is the fact that some LGBT leaders have stated that they don't approve of zoosexuality joining them in their cause to normalize “abnormal” orientations. This would probably create guilt in the zoosexuals, push them further into their “zoosexual closet”, and perpetuate the already existing taboo against zoosexuality. It also explains why there are no “[zoosexual rights](#)” groups – the zoosexuals are afraid of being persecuted if they reveal what they think. The anxiety zoosexuals feel about coming out of the closet is one of the reasons zoosexuality is considered taboo, and may also explain why other subjects are taboo.

Above: there is a lot of zoosexual discrimination

Below are a few examples of irrational and bigoted anti-zoosexual bullying via Facebook comments ([anti-zoosexual discrimination](#)):

“You [a zoosexual] are sick son of a bitch who deserves to be kicked repeatedly in the throat by a professional MMA player. Ass-clown! That is all”

“What a poor excuse for a human being! And he said he his ex-wife didn't see anything wrong with it! Well they are as sick as he is! He needs to see professional help ASAP! Scumbag!” “It is disgusting, and a real perversion. No one needs to “understand” a [zoosexual] relationship. Send him to a psych ward!”

The comments above represent ignorance and bigotry. Comments like “send him to a psych ward” are the kind of ignorant comments that would've been said to a gay person in the 1880s (when people erroneously thought homosexuality was a “mental illness”). Here is a response by a zoosexual person to the above bigoted comments:

“So, this clearly isn't the best cross section of educated opinions. But [I'm] not going to lie to you: shit like this hurts. A lot. To be rejected so outright with such a clear and visceral reaction and with the knowledge that no amount of discourse or scientific evidence could rectify hurts me more than any blind hate spouted by a 12-year-old on YouTube ever could. A part of me aches because a part of me knows that a part of me will always have to be lied about, likely for the rest of my life.” — Pale Blue Knot, <http://pale-blue-knot.tumblr.com...>

My post about [zoosexual discrimination](#) has a very long list of bigoted anti-zoosexual comments from ignorant people all over the Internet — the kind of people who would've had torches and pitchforks if they had lived in the 1600s. After reading comments like those, it's no wonder that so many zoosexuals have to hide in the closet (and are consequently not open about their zoosexuality). If their zoosexuality becomes known, they risk becoming the target of angry vigilante anti-zoosexual bigots with an irrational prejudice and unjustifiable hatred and animosity towards zoosexuals — these individuals could harm them or their property, bully them, or snitch on them to authorities (who are themselves anti-zoosexual bigots and would use some kind of bigoted anti-zoosexual law to unjustly prosecute them [see section 12 below]).

Here is a quote regarding the “zoosexual closet”:

“But how [does one reveal his/her zoosexuality]? What on earth could be a good ice breaker to introduce someone into the world of zoosexuality? As we have seen many times before there are very few, if any, people that we can outright trust. Families have turned their very own children over to police or self-righteous psychologists. It's very hard to find a friend who will keep such a secret safe. And unless you met your significant other through a zoo friendly environment chances are they will take to the idea as well as getting a third wheel for the weekend.

What is one to do? The first thing you MUST do is be careful! With so many people out there wanting to show their moral superiority by literally enslaving us to their beliefs, you can't be too cautious. But what exactly is going on in someone's head when you break the news to them? We all know the unfortunate thought process of close-minded people. [...] There are seven levels of competencies, in order from the first level to the final one: ignorance, awareness, understanding, appreciation, acceptance, internalization and adaptation. These different levels perfectly demonstrate what someone will go through when exposed to a lifestyle different than their own.[...] Believe it or not, most people are truly ignorant to the existence of a zoosexual orientation let alone the fact that people actually participate in it.[...] There are several [Internet sites] dedicated to providing equal rights to zoosexuals. Sadly, most rescue and abuse societies are against zoosexuality citing many myths and incorrect information. [...] The truth is there is no cookie cutter way to introduce someone to a new culture or act. It takes a special person to internalize something that they themselves may never participate in. There are a few things that you can do to portray a positive zoosexual image. Be clean, honest, approachable, respectful, and smart. It's key to be someone that is hard to hate. If you are an all-around good person who is appealing and respectful of other feelings and beliefs, they will have little recourse but to say 'you're alright, not my bag but alright'. And be smart. Understand both sides of the debate and know the opposing view just as well as your own. Be able to dispel myths using creditable non zoo related sources.

If all works out well you will still have your friend and best of all someone who understands you and accepts you as you. It's not something to rush into, but to take your time in considering and delivering. [...] Take your time, consider your options, and be very picky when you decide who you are going to tell that you are a zoosexual. There is a lot of support available, but there isn't a lot that can be done when the wrong person finds out and comes after you and your lover.” — Dogbert's Zoo, <http://dogbertzoo.blogspot.com/?...>

The above quote demonstrates the difficulties zoosexuals face when they try to come out of the closet. In many ways, a gay person coming out of the closet could be seen as *easy* compared to coming out of the zoosexual closet. Whereas homosexuals have at least **some** support and acceptance, zoosexuals have virtually **none**.

Regarding the zoosexual closet, a Wikipedia article stated that although sex with animals is legal in Sweden, there is still an irrational, knee-jerk social stigma and taboo associated with it, which keeps people in the closet:

“Evidence showed that many remarkable men [in Sweden] had sexual experiences with animals and had to live a life in constant fear because of that. Those men had been widely respected but would have lost everything if their activities would have become known; all their great contributions would have been forgotten due to a ‘primitive moral reaction’.” —

<http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/zo...>

Oftentimes, people feel confused about their zoosexual feelings because society has been telling them for their entire lives that sex with animals is immoral, disgusting etc (the usual bullsh*t). People *should* just say “f*ck them” to those who reject them and accept themselves for who they are. However, not everyone is this confident, and many never reach the stage of self-acceptance. For example, read these quotes:

“I want to tell people [about my zoosexuality] so damn bad [that] it eats me up inside to the point that I sometimes think that anything can be better than [hiding in the closet]. I worry [about suicide] because I got a couple guns in my room, but the thought is always there but if I die then what will happen when I’m gone? I fear when I die my family will grieve and hate me for my death. Suicide is a one way ticket and I know this, but my heart and love can’t take that much more hiding, I want to tell people [that I am zoosexual], but if I do I don’t know what will happen, I fear the consequences.

Even my best friend doesn’t know because I once brought up the subject of animal loving and he shot the subject down by telling me that anyone who thinks and does that is an enemy to him. I cant even tell the one person I tell everything too! But since I found [[Zoophilia and Bestiality Community](#)], I can express my love without any fear of people making me an outcast; this forum saves lives... mine is probably one of them, but who knows what will happen tomorrow.” —

33k121, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

And a second quote:

“Writing this is very difficult. I’m an 18-year-old young lady in college and am interested in bestiality, only involving dogs. I am very confused with these interests and have weighed them in my strong (secular) ethical codes, which I pride myself deeply upon and are my absolute being. I’ve never spoken to anyone about this, or even written it down. I’ve concluded that my interests (obviously involving consensual activities) don’t go against my ethics because they are not harmful in any way, but bestiality is so severely taboo that I’m ashamed of having this interest.

If anyone in my present life were to learn this about me, I know I would be irreversibly shunned and judged. I’m more turned on by this and experience more sexual satisfaction watching videos [of humans having sex with animals] than I do in intimacy with my boyfriend, who I love unconditionally. He and I have a relationship that is substantial in every way, but if I ever even hinted to him about this, I’m not sure if he would be able to respect me at all. We share a

genuine love for animals that defines our ethics and lifestyle, as we're vegetarians, and I feel that he would consider what I'm interested in as animal abuse among other immoral things. Also, it would be so out of character for who I am, he would probably reject me because he wouldn't think I was the person that I am.

I just...don't know how to deal with this. If I was given the choice, I would just erase this interest altogether from my mind, but I know that I can't and have to keep it a secret. I try to look at other erotic materials for satisfaction, but nothing even comes close to how much this turns me on. How have you dealt with these feelings, if you've had them? And if you haven't had them, why not?" — Leeit, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

If one views the bad parts of society (i.e. intolerance) as an illness, then guilt would be a *symptom* of that illness. Some people are more *resistant* to the intolerance "illness" than others, and so they are not "infected" with the guilt. However, some people (such as "Leeit" in the above quote) let their guilt control them. When "Leeit" says she looks at non-zoosexual material in an attempt to deliberately "eradicate" her zoosexuality, that is equivalent to an insecure gay person who looks at heterosexual material to try to "make" himself/herself heterosexual. People who do this are denying who they are — gay people shouldn't pretend to be straight, and zoosexuals shouldn't pretend to be non-zoosexuals.

In response to the above quote by Leeit, "Jeepdog89" said the following:

"For me, it took 2 years of exactly what you have described to come to terms with myself[...] One could say I am similar to you in that I follow similar strong ethical codes and have concluded the no harm / no foul rule to apply. The fact remains that bestiality is risky business even in the most liberal crowd. Much more than the general majority are prepared to handle thinking about.

The way I dealt with my early feelings of shame and overall disgust was time. Unfortunately, it's the hard route, but it seems to have worked well for me. Like I said, I was battling myself for two years trying to make it go away. Of course, I wanted nothing to do with anything even close to bestiality. Eventually I realized that the feeling was not going to go away and I explored it a little bit more. By 'explored' I mean I educated myself. I have not had any sort of experience to date. What I did was simply and plainly learn as much as I could and when I realized once and for all that cross-species intercourse is harmless and that I wasn't alone in the world, I was able to feel better about myself." — Jeepdog89, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

And here is a quote similar to Jeepdog89's quote (it is by a person who was talking to a closeted zoosexual person):

"I very slowly [came] to grips with my attraction to animals, and it bothered me. I felt like I must be sick, twisted. Like I was delusional or insane. Basically, all of my training in today's society screamed at me with big big bold letters: THERE IS SOMETHING WRONG WITH YOU. But after a while [of being on [Zoophilia and Bestiality Community](#)], I saw something strange. The [zoosexual people on beastforum] weren't sick. They were just like me. They had families, parents, wives, children. They liked sports, went to bars. They had homework to do, bills to pay, homes to clean. They were functional, kind, and interesting people. And they were also just zoos. I started to realize that this interest in animals didn't define me. It didn't brand me as evil or

sick. It just meant I was the same me, same as before, same person, I just happened to like animals too.

I joined [beastforum], started talking to others, and now it doesn't bother me. It's just a small fraction of who I am. I like the people here, like animals, and even though my upbringing and society have trained me otherwise, they don't matter to me anymore as much as my own happiness and sense of self.

So it's OK to be scared. I was. But don't run or deny it from yourself. Hang around a while and you'll see. We're not different than everyday people you'd see on the street. We're not sick. We're not evil. And neither are you for feeling what you feel [zoosexual feelings]. The forum is here to talk with you, comfort you, and advise you. Good luck. And remember, you are NOT alone.”— Cheeseyness, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

Below is another quote relating to the [zoosexual closet](#). A person on Yahoo Answers said that she was sexually attracted to a dog and didn't know how to express herself. In response, the following was said by a person called Teinaava:

“Realize that there's nothing wrong with being a zoophile. Zoophilia is a sexual orientation just like heterosexuality or homosexuality. Zoophiles (like me) love the animal they choose to be their partner and would do anything to keep them from coming to harm. They treat them as you would a human spouse, i.e., take care of them, spend time with them, make sure they're happy, etc. A lot of people seem to think that just because someone is attracted to animals, that they go around raping every animal they see. However, that's not true; while some may do that, most don't. And yes, animals can consent to sex with humans, though it's not through words like humans do. For example, if a female dog wants to have sex with you, she'll do things like turning her butt towards you and moving her tail to the side, rubbing herself against your crotch, etc. If you respond to her advances and have sex with her, how is that not consensual? Besides, if an animal doesn't want to have sex, it can say no with its claws, teeth, hooves, horns, etc. Also, most zoophiles love their partner, regardless of the sex, and even if he/she didn't show an interest in it, they would love him/her just the same. Anyone who rapes animals or uses them as sex toys is perverted and should be grouped with rapists and pedophiles. But that's getting off the subject. So, I think you should take some time and think before you come to any decisions. Try getting used to the idea that you may be attracted to dogs.” — Teinaava, <http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20100508180716AAI34IS>

The person who made the above quote (Teinaava) went on to say the following to a person who thought he might be an equine zoosexual:

“Don't worry, there's nothing wrong with you. You may just be a zoophile, meaning that you're attracted to animals, and there's nothing wrong with that. You may feel a bit weird since this is the first time you're feeling this, but give yourself some time to get used to it. I'm a zoophile too, though I'm attracted to dogs instead of horses, and I wouldn't trade the love of a dog for anything. So, you should give it a chance. Maybe go to some ranches and spend some time around horses and see how you feel. And, if you are a zoophile, then that's who you are and there's nothing wrong with it.” — Teinaava, <http://answers.yahoo.com/questio...>

And here is a similar quote by a person named “Smith Baker”:

“Know what, I’m sick of hearing people AND the media [attack zoophiles]. [The zoosexual lifestyle] is the life we live because we choose to live our life with an open mind, and that we were brought onto this world to love and give love to everything around us. Some of us find relationships in an animal, and regard humans as something that would be lower than an animal. [The zoosexual lifestyle] is like a religion to us: we treat animals as we would our own lover or mate, and yes sometimes this does involve sex, but it’s not played out like it is in the media where you just go and rape a damn dog, it’s not like that whatsoever.

When you choose to make love with your [non-human] lover, you do it as you would with a human, there’s loving, kissing, holding, everything like that; animals are very affectionate beings, and we treat them with the same love and respect as they give us. There are so many people out there who think we [zoosexual people] should be killed, or castrated, or tortured, because they are under the close-minded assumption that we rape animals when in fact this is not the case at all. I know most of you are going to read this and be disgusted and I understand, because this is not your life [and] you think there’s something wrong with us, but in fact we see everything so clearly, and regard those who don’t understand us and [those who] harm us as the blind ones.

All I’m asking is that you give our lifestyle a thought — we don’t rape animals and we are ALL animal activists. There are thousands of us, and we all share the same passion for animals you do, except we treat these animals as we would our own kin, our own blood.[...] All we ask is that you think about it with an open mind, not a closed one, we love these animals more than you could ever know, and we NEVER harm animals, we are just as much against that as you.” — Smith Baker, <http://www.nola.com/crime/index....>

As I mentioned earlier in this post, Wrongdiagnosis claims that having a sexual attraction to animals is a “mental illness”, which I think is a bunch of bullsh*t. However, despite this flawed psychological perspective, there are (luckily) some people out there who have a more rational view of zoosexuality. For example, read this quote:

“I [saw a therapist] some years ago. And guess what he told me. He said, ‘I do not see anything wrong with what you are doing, you are truly taking care of you dogs, far more than a lot of people do. Besides, what goes behind the closed doors of your house is up to, and no one else. Enjoy yourself, and have fun.’ Still remember those words today.” — <http://www.topix.com/forum/news/...>

The person in the quote above is a cynophile (a person [sexually attracted to dogs](#)). As stated earlier in this post, cynophilia is one of many subcategories of zoophilia. What’s important to note in the above quote is that when an actual therapist was consulted about zoosexuality, he/she found nothing wrong with it. The therapist didn’t see it as “deviant”, or “perverted”, or “abnormal”, or “disgusting” — the therapist did not have any problems with it, because he/she recognized that the cynophile **was a good person and not a zoosadist**.

As I said before, zoosexuality is **not** a “mental disorder” — if one’s zoosexual feelings do not cause him/her distress, then it is NOT a disorder. The reason people have classified zoosexuality as a “mental disorder” and “mental illness” is because of ignorance and irrational anti-zoosexual bigotry (the same kind of ignorance and bigotry that caused homosexuality to be classified as a

“mental disorder” for most of the 20th century). Therapies which try to stop people from being zoosexual are just as useless and harmful as therapies which try to make homosexual people less gay (i.e. the “pray the gay away”). Psychologists who have a negative attitude towards zoosexuality should be avoided by zoosexuals, since they will only make a zoosexual person’s life worse.

Also, remember that in some jurisdictions such as Oregon and Arizona, there are irrational and unjustifiable laws which **force** zoosexual people who are caught to undergo “intensive psychological evaluation” — these laws treat zoosexual people like abnormal specimens of fungi (and stomp on their rights and liberties). Laws which force zoosexual people to undergo “psychological evaluation” ONLY because of the fact that zoosexuality is involved are discriminatory and should be struck down or repealed. Some of the mentioned laws give judges unjust power to force zoosexuals to undergo these harmful “psychological evaluations” which are likely to have an anti-zoosexual prejudice (and essentially force the a zoosexual person to pay for anti-zoosexual “treatment” that he/she knows is a bunch of bulls**t). No wonder so many zoosexual people hide in the closet — they don’t want to have their liberties and rights trampled on.

In addition, zoosexual people hide in the closet because they are afraid of discriminatory and unfair restrictions being placed on them if they “come out” (example of unfair restrictions: having their animal lovers (soul mates) unjustly confiscated from them, and being forced to not own animals for no legitimate reason — these tragic and heartbreaking consequences of being caught cause most zoosexuals to hide in the closet).

Here is another quote relating to zoosexuality and psychology:

“If [a person] is zoosexual, there is no ‘getting rid of it’, or curbing it, it’s a valid orientation just like any other. I’ve seen many other zoosexuals commit suicide over the years because they felt like they were alone, unaccepted and hated as well as other reasons.” —

Sydney, <http://answers.yahoo.com/question/...>

Below is a quote by a German equinosexual man:

“A [non-zoosexual] person wrote: ‘If they (the zoophiles) would only stick to one animal, seeing it as their lifetime partner and quit doing things that can only be interpreted as a let-out of their over-exaggerated sex-drive (such as fencehopping), I wouldn’t be happy with it, but I would tolerate it.’ Another [non-zoosexual] person wrote: ‘I would be OK with [zoosexual activity] if the zoophiles, for example, allow a certain number of unscheduled visits from a neutral veterinarian making sure the animal does not suffer in any way, neither physically nor psychologically’. I think the message is clear here: It’s all about getting away from the false idea that zoophilia is only conducted by people without any morals. [...]

I have [come out of the zoosexual closet] to close friends and what I heard the most was the question: “Do you hurt your mare?”, followed by “I hope you’re not one of these ruthless and egoistic idiots seeing animals a a live sex toy”. I always harshly decline this and tell them that I see my mare as my wife, never cheat on her, treat her as an equal individual, put her needs far ahead of mine and anything else you would expect from a caring and loving husband. They usually are totally cool with that, some of them even accompanied me when I visit my mare to

see how she is behaving towards me. This usually does it for them and whenever they hear someone hating me [because of my zoosexuality], they defend me as much as they can. What I do with this, in small dimensions of course, has to be done in big dimensions. One by one, the whole society has to be “infiltrated” [educating them about why zoosexuality is ethical]. We need to be the waterdrop that finally conquers the stone by constantly dripping on it.[...] Let us [zoosexuals] come up with a new version of a zoophile codex and make it known among the public, so that distinguishing the [ethical zoosexual people] from the [unethical bestialists] will be more easy for them. Morals are the key to acceptance. Anything else, such as a genuine spokesperson [for the zoosexual rights movement], will follow automatically.” — Germanhorsey, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

A person responded to Germanhorsey by saying the following:

“I feel [zoosexual people] can provide creditable testimony or supportive evidence of it [zoosexual activity] being non-cruelty to animals, and also [that zoosexuality] does not lead to child crimes. I feel as with a lot of legislation that pushes the envelope, a constitutional issue has to be raised. And if someone is to represent zoosexuals, it will be most likely someone that can benefit via fame or fortune, and definitely be non-zoo. I feel if [a zoosexual person] with big bucks was to get outed and end up in the spotlight, tons of money thrown at a law firm may help bring it to a better judicial understanding. But I would prefer it be solved on a piecemeal basis where a small-town judge shoots down an [anti-zoosexual] statute because of constitutionality. Indeed if no one was harmed, and if our new laws are not to be moral based, then [zoosexuality should be legal]. [...] Additionally, the medical community will have to get involved. If a zoosexual person was brought to trial, and expert testimony from a veterinarian could be provided that no harm was done, then this would advance the [zoosexual] cause. As yet I have not heard or read of this in the US. I would say if you are a [zoosexual person], and you have a vet do regular check-ups on your animal, the vet could be called to testify should you be outed.” — Pony4Ever, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

SECTION 12: IRRATIONAL, DISCRIMINATORY, INTOLERANT ANTI-ZOOSEXUAL LAWS

There is a paradox worth mentioning – the more zoophiles try to endorse zoosexual rights, the more they worry that “witch hunts” will begin and there will be a big backlash from “moralistic”, self-righteous vigilante groups; because of this zoophiles feel that their only way they can protect their way of life is to not be recognized by anyone and to fly under the radar, because they argue that it would be too difficult to fight to become accepted, and that a fight for acceptance might destroy them.

Another issue with zoosexuality is its legality. It is not officially “legal” in any single country, but it is outlawed in several countries and in about 38 U.S. states (map below). It is **appalling** that so many states have banned interspecies sex between humans and other animals. The laws against zoosexuality were created due to social taboos, ignorance, prejudice, zoophile phobia (zoophobia), intolerance, speciesism, bigotry and irrationality. They were also created due to anti-zoosexual vigilantes going on crusades and “witch hunts” against zoosexuals.

(Above: green states = sex with animals is legal (de facto); red states = sex with animals is a misdemeanor; dark red states = sex with animals is a felony; brown states = sex with animals is a misdemeanor for first time caught and felony for second time caught; yellow states = sex with animals is still illegal (as a felony) but potentially legal due to a court ruling (anti-zoosexual law was never removed). Note that some U.S. territories such as Puerto Rico, Guam and American Samoa are also shown at the bottom of the map. Map current as of January 2014.)

Zoosexual acts are unjustly illegal in about 70% of U.S. jurisdictions (38 states and 2 territories), and zoosexual acts are legal in about 30% of U.S. jurisdictions (12 states, DC, 3 territories, and the U.S. Minor Outlying Islands). Lawmakers should be **decriminalizing** zoosexual acts, but unfortunately in recent years they have gone in the opposite direction, adopting an ignorant medieval view of anti-zoosexuality. The legality of zoosexuality in U.S. jurisdictions is discussed in the post [“Which states are the most anti-zoosexual?”](#), and a list of countries where zoosexuality is legal/illegal can be found in the [zoosexual rights](#) post.

Laws against zoosexual acts in the U.S. fall into the following categories:

Category #1: Archaic laws — archaic laws are antiquated laws based on a flawed sense of “morality” (often driven by religious bigotry) that were created centuries ago, and to this day nobody has bothered to get rid of them (example: Rhode Island’s “crime against nature” law was created in 1647 [about 367 years before the present and 129 years before the Declaration of Independence] — the part of the law criminalizing homosexuality was removed in the 1990s, but the anti-zoosexual part remains on the books to this day.) These bad laws are generally called “sodomy” laws or “crime against nature” laws (even though inter-species sex is not “unnatural”). Most of these archaic laws originally (or still do) have anti-gay components, though most of them have been recently modified so that the anti-gay part is removed but the anti-zoo part is NOT removed.

Category #2: NEW bullst anti-zoosexual laws** — These laws are more of a threat to zoosexual people because they are **recently-created** laws which are **specifically** anti-zoosexual and tend to have bigoted language that is more precise and less vague than those in the archaic category. These laws **completely fail** to protect ethical zoosexuals and unfairly criminalize ANY kind of interspecies sexual interaction. Delaware’s anti-zoosexual law (created in 1993) is generally considered to be the first in this category of “new” laws. PA made an anti-zoosexual law in 1999, and the states of OR, IA, ME, MO, IL, IN, WA, AZ, TN, CO, AK and FL have all made anti-zoosexual laws **since the year 2000** (the insidious, bigoted laws in all of these states are less than 14 years old). When an archaic “sodomy” or “crimes against nature” law is removed in a jurisdiction, that jurisdiction often created a “category 2” law in order to fill the “hole” left behind after the archaic anti-gay & anti-zoo law is removed. These new laws are irrational and bigoted. They are the 21st century versions of the “archaic” laws, and they often are **disguised** as anti-cruelty laws (when in reality the purpose of their existence is the same purpose the archaic laws were created — flawed “morality”, ignorance, and anti-zoosexual hatred, prejudice, intolerance and bigotry).

Subcategory of category #2: “Sneaky” laws — there are some jurisdictions which have “sneaky” anti-zoosexual laws, meaning that in the past 15 years (recently) some jurisdictions have quietly modified an already existing law and tainted it with anti-zoosexual bulls**t. Two states that have

done this are Colorado and Connecticut. Their anti-zoosexual laws are not “stand-alone” and are instead “attached” to an already existing law (infecting it like a virus). CT did this in 2005 and CO did this in 2007.

It is worth noting that anti-zoosexual laws are sometimes erroneously called “animal sexual assault” laws, which is a bunch of bullsh*t because not all zoosexual acts involve “assault” — most zoosexual acts are ethical and non-abusive.

In Australia, zoosexual acts are criminalized at the state level (like in the U.S.), but unlike the U.S., zoosexual acts have been unjustly criminalized in ALL of Australia’s mainland jurisdictions, including the ACT (it was criminalized in the ACT in 2011). The only places in Australia where zoosexual activity is legal are the overseas territories (such as Christmas Island and Norfolk Island). Most of the state-level laws banning ethical zoosexual sex were created **centuries** ago, and the state-level governments in Australia have failed to repeal them. Penalties vary from state to state, but they are generally much harsher than U.S. laws. For example, the maximum sentence in Tasmania is 21 years in prison and the maximum prison sentence in South Australia is 10 years in prison. In 2011, when several people in South Australia were arrested after they had **ethical sexual intercourse** with a dog, the judge admitted that the SA law was ridiculous and that it was not up to him to determine the morality of zoosexual acts; he did however penalize them with a small prison sentence anyway:

“[The accused people stated that] the animals were not physically harmed, mistreated or in any distress as a result of the [zoosexual] behaviour, and the owner of the dogs contended they seemed to enjoy the activity. The prosecution accepted the [defense's claim of] welfare of the animals, and the RSPCA chose not to take any action.[...] [The judge] considered it outside his role to consider the appropriateness of the criminalisation of bestiality.[...] The case raises issues of legal moralism and criminalisation in the absence of harm. Neither the SA parliament nor courts have engaged with the argument, most prominently promoted by ethicist Peter Singer, that sexual activity between animals and humans is not necessarily exploitative or abusive of the animal and not an affront to an individual’s humanity, as human beings are also animals.” —

<http://www.altj.org/news-and-vi...>

The comments above about South Australia’s courts applies to courts pretty much everywhere — in other words, courts all over the world have **failed** to address (or have completely **ignored**) the idea that zoosexual activity can occur ethically. In some cases, courts have even refused to believe hard evidence that no harm occurred during zoosexual activity (for example a 2012 attempt to rule Florida’s anti-zoosexual law unconstitutional failed because the judge had an anti-zoosexual prejudice and stubbornly refused to entertain the idea that the law is unjust and unconstitutional). It is clear that in terms of zoosexual rights, more work needs to be done in the judicial field — judges need to become educated about how zoosexual activity is ethical and why anti-zoosexual laws **must** be struck down.

Because zoosexuality’s legality in the United States is so ambiguous and arbitrary, this is an indicator that many of the laws created against zoosexuality are probably archaic and not based on enlightened thinking (similar to the way that until a 2003 Supreme Court ruling, there were many U.S. states, mostly in the deep south, that banned homosexual acts). Prostitution is illegal in 49 out of 50 states, demonstrating that anti-prostitution is apparently a “core” value of the U.S. However, zoosexuality is neither legal nor illegal in all states, so it would seem that the prohibition of zoosexuality is not a “core” value but rather a series of laws created by either

isolated incidents or individuals [such as Nan Rich](#) who are obsessed with making zoosexuality illegal. People like Nan Rich are prejudicial and have zoophile phobia (“zoophobia”). Nan Rich is an ignorant anti-zoosexual bigot who nagged the Florida legislature year after year to ban zoosexuality until she got her way (i.e. “the squeaky wheel gets the grease”) — she had no rational reason for her anti-zoosexual ban (it was created out of ignorance and prejudice), and nobody questioned the ban (because people in the FL legislature are ignorant with regard to zoosexuality and **assume** it is bad because of their irrational prejudices and flawed moral compasses).

The same could be said about the anti-homosexuality laws – they were created by bigots and close-minded people who were either religious or had some psychological problem with accepting homosexuality. I find it amazing that with so many important issues out there, some people would rather waste their time persecuting minorities rather than solving problems which affect the world.

Above: Legal status of zoosexuality throughout the world as of 2014

Outside of the United States, zoosexuality is legal in a few countries, such as Mexico, Brazil, Russia, Japan, Cambodia, Thailand, Denmark, Hungary and Finland. But overall, the sad truth is that there are many countries which have unjustly criminalized it, including Canada, Australia proper, New Zealand, the UK, India, the Netherlands, France, Germany and Sweden. What is especially disturbing is that the trend in recent years has been towards criminalizing it (the trend **should** be towards **decriminalizing** it). As an example, Belgium criminalized zoosexuality in 2007, the Netherlands criminalized zoosexuality in 2010, Germany criminalized it in 2013 and Sweden criminalized it in 2014. In other words, all of these laws are recent and created for completely irrational and unjustifiable reasons. The same is true in the United States — many anti-zoosexual laws in the U.S. have been created recently; for example, Washington state criminalized zoosexuality in 2006, Arizona criminalized zoosexuality in 2006, Alaska criminalized it in 2010 and Florida criminalized it in 2011. This **needs to stop** — these laws do not differentiate between ethical zoosexual people and people who actually abuse animals — and because of this they are unfair (and unconstitutional) and should be **repealed**. There is **no** legitimate reason for their existence (they are often created because of people’s irrational prejudice, disgust, ignorance and bigotry). U.S. states and countries should **bedecriminalizing** ethical forms of zoosexuality, not criminalizing it — yet countries (especially in Europe) continue to criminalize it and are going in the wrong direction.

Anti-zoosexual laws serve no purpose because the only cases worthy of prosecution (i.e. those which involve extreme zoosadism) can be dealt with by using existing animal cruelty laws; law specifically prohibiting bestiality are unnecessary and discriminatory. People are going to have sex with animals regardless of whether there is a law or not; therefore, interspecies sex should not be penalized. Many people come to the incorrect conclusion that **all** zoosexual acts involve cruelty — this is not true. Unfortunately, this incorrect belief has already been embedded into many legal systems.

Anti-zoosexual laws also:

- 1) Prevent zoosexuality from being accepted
 - 2) Prevent zoosexual people from being open about their zoosexual feelings
 - 3) Establish a restrictive atmosphere which perpetuates ignorance about zoosexuality
 - 4) Perpetuate the “taboo” status of zoosexuality
 - 5) Perpetuate discrimination against zoosexuals
 - 6) Unjustly restrict the individual freedom of ethical zoosexuals
- For example, anti-zoosexual laws often unethically force zoosexual people to not own animals
- 7) Unjustly put all forms of zoosexual acts (both ethical and unethical) in the same category
 - 8) Are used to justify people’s hostility towards zoosexual people (i.e. their intolerance and bigotry)
 - 9) Make it difficult to discuss zoosexuality openly and positively
 - 10) Make it difficult to establish public demonstrations/rallies in favor of zoosexuality
 - 11) Enable ignorant speciesism and anthropocentrism to flourish
 - 12) Cause zoosexual people to take their animals to the vet less often (out of fear that a vet would find out about the zoosexual acts and contact authorities)
 - 13) Cause zoosexual people to live in fear, hide in the closet, and go underground (and be silent about their beliefs)
 - 14) Give authorities the unjust power to prosecute incidents which involved no cruelty whatsoever
 - 15) Enables “tipsters” to snitch on ethical zoosexual people (yet another burden placed upon zoosexual people); the unethical actions of the “tipsters” are permitted by the unjust laws
 - 16) Are unconstitutional (anti-zoosexual laws violate the U.S. constitution)
 - 17) Are unethical and are created due to irrational fear, ignorance, bigotry, intolerance and speciesism
 - 18) Create situations which could potentially ruin the lives of zoosexuals (for example, anti-zoosexual laws often give authorities an excuse to raid a zoosexual person’s home, unjustly invade their privacy, take their property and forcefully take their animals away from him/her permanently [sometimes even killing the animals involved])
- Anti-zoosexual laws often have tragic, heartbreaking and unethical penalties for zoosexual people (people who have non-abusive sex with animals) who are “outed”: For example, in many cases a zoosexual person’s animal partner is confiscated (stolen) from them by authorities who have an anti-zoosexual prejudice. In many cases, the zoosexual person is never able to see their animal lover again, and this causes them great distress, depression and heartbreak, as well as anger at the bigots who took his/her animal away. Meanwhile, the confiscated animal is usually treated unethically (i.e. put in a cage, killed via euthanasia, etc.) The frightened animals want to be with their owner again but are traumatized by the bigoted authorities who unjustly confiscated (stole) them from their rightful owner.
- 19) Some anti-zoosexual laws unethically force a zoosexual person who is “outed” to undergo bulls**t “psychological treatment” and “counseling” (both of which are likely to be tainted by anti-zoosexual prejudice), and force the zoosexual person to pay for these unethical and harmful “psychological treatments” against his/her will. This kind of unethical “mandatory

psychological” bullsh**t was used to “treat” gay people in the 1950s (because people erroneously thought homosexuality was a disease that could be “cured”).

(Reminder: a person’s intrinsic quality of being zoosexual does not mean he/she is “mentally ill” — anti-zoosexual laws are delusional and do not recognize this)

20) When zoosexual activity is criminalized, it gives anti-zoosexual people an **excuse** to claim it’s “immoral” (for example, people will say “it is immoral because it is illegal”). This twisted logic enables them to criticize zoosexual acts simply because of the fact that they are illegal (and not for any justifiable reason)

It has become clear to me that laws against human-animal sexual contact are not only discriminatory, but also irrational and immoral. Anti-zoosexual laws should be abolished because there is no legitimate reason for their existence (especially since interspecies sex is natural part of life on Earth). For example, read this quote:

“[Few people] dared to challenge its underlying premise — that sex between human beings and animals should be illegal under all circumstances. In fact, despite the concerns of opponents like Notre Dame Philosophy professor Ralph McInery that decriminalization of bestiality was ‘an idea whose hour will surely come, and soon’, the reality is that the past few years have witnessed a dramatic increase in anti-bestiality statutes[...] Unfortunately, the legislative debate over these bans has lacked even the pretense of serious reflection or intellectual rigor. Instead, most lawmakers have relied upon widespread public repugnance to justify legal action. As a co-sponsor of the Washington State Law [banning bestiality], State Senator Bob McCaslin, said: ‘How could you be for bestiality? My God!’ Such an approach differs greatly from the way our society addresses most legal prohibitions, where we place the burden upon those supporting such restrictions to prove that laws are necessary[...]

I suspect that the vast majority of lawmakers who voted for anti-bestiality statutes do not eschew hamburgers, leather-goods or even fur — not to mention cleansers and cosmetics safety-tested on the eyes of lab rabbits[...] Washington State’s [anti-bestiality] law was inspired, in part, because of the tragedy of Kenneth Pinyan, a zoophile who was fatally injured while having sex with an Arabian Stallion. However, opponents of bestiality have never offered evidence that such acts are common enough to justify legislative action. Moreover, the uncomplimentary language of these prohibitionists used to describe Pinyan at the time of his death suggests that his welfare was not their primary concern.”—<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/t...>

Also, read the following quotes:

*“Laws restricting the private conduct of individuals in which ‘a person’s conduct affects the interests of no person but himself, or need not affect them unless they like,’ unjustly constrain the legal and moral rights of such individuals. **Laws which criminalize zoophilia based on societal abhorrence of such acts rather than any real harm caused by such acts are an unjust and unconstitutional infringement on individual liberty.** Though it has been argued that such laws are necessary for the protection of both animals and the greater good of society, the reasons given to support such arguments are not compelling. If animal protection was the goal of such laws, it could be accomplished more effectively by strengthening laws that address deliberate infliction of pain and suffering on animals as has been done in Sweden. Laws prohibiting zoophilia are enforced even in the absence of any discernible harm to the animal resulting from*

such acts. The argument that zoophilia needs to be criminalized because of a **possible** link between animal abuse in the wider sense, including acts of intentional cruelty, and violence against other humans, is equally deficient. Such a link is not only **unproven** but is very probably **unprovable** given the wide range of factors that affect human behavior.”—

<http://www.inter-disciplinary.ne...>

*“[Anti-zoosexual laws] allows the state to invade the lives of millions of adults [...] Governments have used [anti-zoosexual laws] to harass [zoosexuals], censor their speech, threaten them with prison and raid their homes. [...] [Anti-zoosexual laws] invade privacy and create inequality. They relegate people to inferior status based on how they look or how they love. They degrade people’s dignity by declaring their most intimate feelings “unnatural” or illegal. The [anti-zoosexual laws] can be used to discredit enemies and destroy careers and lives. They promote violence and give it impunity. They hand police and others the power to arrest, blackmail and abuse. They drive people underground to live in invisibility and fear. [...] It **isnot** the function of the law to intervene in the private lives of citizens, or to seek to enforce any particular pattern of behavior.”* — Adapted from

<http://www.hrw.org/node/77014/se...> (This Alien Legacy)

*“Overall much of the [hostility towards zoosexual activity] can be summarized as coming from speciesism, ignorance, fear and hatred of those who are different, the violation of social norms, and irrational repugnance at the concept of human-animal sexuality; this is presented in a societal context of religious or social abhorrence, and a desire to reduce what is **perceived** to be abuse. Because laws against zoophilia have been created as a result of irrationality, prejudice and moral panic (and not with regard to the animal’s interests), the reasons for creating these laws have been called ‘not compelling’ and have been described as being ‘an unjust and unconstitutional infringement on individual liberty.’ Anti-zoosexual laws have also been criticized because they are subject to cultural relativism, and because humans **are** animals.”* —

<http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/zo...>

Remember what was said earlier in this post: the fact that interspecies sex is **not unnatural**, and many of the weak “arguments” against zoophilia are the same weak “arguments” made against homosexuality:

*“Now, one of the most interesting things about Peter Singer’s approach is the way he dismisses the common arguments against bestiality, for they are the same arguments that have often been made against homosexuality. On libertarian grounds, [arguments regarding homosexuality] are also the same arguments that might incline us to agree with Singer about bestiality —i.e., **that what one does in one’s own barn is none of the government’s business**. The key words here are, of course, ‘normal’ and ‘natural’. Both are terms that have been used to condemn gay sex, and both are equally meaningless when applied to inter-species sex — which is why Singer’s phrasing here is savvy. The words ‘normal’ and ‘natural’ carry no inherent moral weight, and never have. They are statements of fact, to be sure, but not arguments. **They should, then, have no more legal or philosophical bearing on bestiality than they should on homosexuality.**”*—

<http://www.villagevoice.com/2001...>

It should be noted that laws which prohibit ethical zoosexual acts are **not** about “animal cruelty”; they are about a flawed and delusional view of **morality**. For example, consider Indiana, a state which has extremely absurd and irrational animal laws. In Indiana, it is a **felony** for a dog to lick

peanut butter off a woman's vagina, but it is only a **misdemeanor** to torture and kill an animal via a decompression chamber, and it is only a **misdemeanor** to violently rip out a dog's vocal cords. It is also *legal* in Indiana to torture an animal by hunting and killing it with a gun. Indiana's irrational and unjust legal framework is a perfect example of how lawmaking in many places has gone terribly wrong; it is also an example of the fact that anti-zoosexual laws are **not** designed to stop "animal cruelty", they are designed to **punish** people for being "immoral" (even though in reality the people **making** those bad laws are the ones who are **really** immoral). Lawmakers in places like Indiana have abused their power — ethical zoosexual acts should be **legal**, and acts which are **really** cruel to animals (like hunting them, killing them, slaughtering them, etc.) should be **illegal**.

Keep in mind that to many people, zoosexuality is a core part of their spirituality — to them it is sacred (and compassion for animals is also sacred to them). Therefore, when a law is enacted which prohibits ethical forms of zoosexual sex, this law is unconstitutional because it prohibits a person from expressing their spiritual beliefs (in this case, "spiritual" can be seen as a placeholder for "religion"). In the United States, the constitution allows for freedom of religion, and if one views zoosexuality in this context, it is unethical and unconstitutional to create a law which prohibits one's core beliefs, especially when one's practices (in this case, interspecies sex) are harming no one and are not immoral in any way. (see [zoosexuality as part of a spirituality](#))

There have been cases in which authorities learned about a person's zoosexual activity and then forcibly took the zoosexual person's animals away from him/her for their "protection". In reality, this act does **not** "protect" the animals, it traumatizes them and ruins their lives — they long to be with their original owner again but cannot because of ignorant bigoted people who don't understand what it means to be zoosexual. The same is true for the zoosexual person who lost his/her animals — he/she is traumatized, heartbroken, and feels that their spiritual beliefs have been severely violated. He/she is also angry at the people who unjustly took his/her animals. Because of this, the forcible taking of animals from good zoosexual people is an extremely unethical and heartbreaking desecration of their sacred way of life.

And also, remember that in many cases, **due process** and **equality** before the law are often unethically **disregarded** because of people's irrational "gut hatred" of zoosexuality. In Delaware, a state where zoosexual acts are a felony, two people were unjustly arrested in January 2013 for having sex with a dog, even though no harm occurred. Their privacy was severely invaded, and the authorities were irresponsible in how they handled it. Here are several quotes with regard to that incident:

*"[The Delaware case] is another example of anti-zoosexual bigotry, especially in a case like this where there appears to be no harm done. As usual, a "concerned citizen" (as the source puts it) snitched on them and (because zoosexuals are not protected under the law), the "snitcher" is able to screw up the lives of zoosexuals (while the "snitcher" sits back and watches). It should be the opposite: zoosexuals should be protected under the law and should **not** be prosecuted, while "snitchers" and "informants" who invade people's privacy **should** be prosecuted. Also, to make matters worse, the actual real street address of the Delaware victims are revealed in the above news source (which is pretty disturbing and is an outright invasion of privacy)." — Zqwm7, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>*

“[In response to above quote]: As usual the rights of the others are violated in making headlines. Obviously, the couple have no rights to privacy. It appears that the police do not care about anything other than self-promotion of their narrow minded views.” — St Benard, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>;

“[In response to above quote]: Don’t we have the right to face our accusers in the US? Seriously. If someone was to say something about me, I want to face them. Have them say it to my face. I want their name. [If] they are going to screw up my life, then they can have theirs ruined as well. It is called karma. Bad karma...” — jamagh, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

“We are socially unacceptable to the degree that we [zoosexuals] are perceived as guilty even when accused by faceless individuals in the dark of the night with no evidence against us. The official law like to think of us as “non-human” and “inhuman monsters”. So, it becomes acceptable to skirt the rules and procedures of the law to get us because we are so “evil”. We are a feel-good enemy to society — one that can be easily and repeatedly knocked over, trampled on and denigrated so those self-appointed “morality” police of society can hold up our bleeding corpses as proof of their own self-righteous power and victory. So sadly you won’t get the names [of the snitchers], because justice is not as important as it is to get the “monsters” in the community.” — energydog, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

“None of [the anti-zoosexual laws] are about preventing abuse. That is just a way of spinning it to try and get the public on the side of the anti-zoo bigots.” — dirtbiker2000, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

The above quotes remind us of the fact that bigoted, intolerant, unjust, discriminatory anti-zoosexual legislation (usually created by arrogant, bigoted speciesists) often becomes law in places like Delaware, and their unjust draconian bullsh** is never questioned by anyone because zoosexuality is taboo and everyone erroneously **assumes** that zoosexuality is “bad”. Horrible anti-zoosexual laws like the one in Delaware need to be eradicated, and new anti-zoosexual legislation needs to be prevented. As *Lawrence vs. Texas* (a Supreme Court ruling) showed us, with regard to harmless private sexual acts between mature beings, people’s perceptions of “morality” should not be embedded into the law:

“The personal morals of the majority, whether based on religion or traditions, cannot be used as a reason to deprive a person of their personal liberties”

Below is a quote regarding wisdom (in terms of defining “abuse” in the law):

“I think it would be better not to have any specific laws against sexual offenses at all. Instead, it would make more sense only to punish general abuse. Treating sexual abuse separately from non-sexual abuse can be used to distract from the severity of non-sexual abuse.”

*The issue with consensual sexual intercourse with non-human animals is a rather delicate issue. Often, due to speciesism, it is claimed axiomatically that non-human animals can’t “consent” to sexual intercourse with human animals, with no real basis in reality. I think it’s in the interest of utilitarians to **not** restrict the spectrum of pleasant activities for animals arbitrarily; [therefore, there should not be any laws which prohibit zoosexual activity].”* —

<http://felicifia.org/viewtopic.p...>

Here are two quotes which are responses to an anti-zoosexual who was advocating for irrational anti-zoosexual laws:

“As an admirer of E.F.A. [Equality for All, a zoosexual rights organization] I applaud your efforts on behalf of all helpless, abused animals. There is nothing sadder to me – and many of us – than seeing defenseless animals abused for human gratification, whether it be sexual, financial, cosmetic, culinary, ornamental, entertainment or any other well-documented type of abuse.

But, as you point out, not all zoosexual people are cruel, or even indifferent, to their animal partners. On the contrary, true zoosexual people are more concerned about their non-human partners than anyone else. To lump everyone into one category and make all zoosexual people criminals just to save law-enforcement the ‘trouble’ of discerning between the lovers and the abusers is a very dangerous step in the wrong direction. you open the door to criminalizing entire swaths of human population every time a problem arises. That attitude brings you prohibition, drug wars, Patriot act and numerous other absurd over-kills. To criminalize hundreds of millions of people just to protect some animals is also absurd as humans are also animals. We can’t be lazy, and we must carefully outlaw the abusers without panicking and pushing several percentages of the human population underground.

Watch Sir Tijn Po’s COMING SOON, read Peter Singer’s HEAVY PETTING, and you might change your approach a bit. Perhaps you can even join forces with E.F.A.” —

<http://www.webpronews.com/zoophi...>

“Jenny, I just want to address the points you have made as I doubt you realize how daft some of your things you have said are.

1) Animals do not need to be trained or conditioned into having sex with people. Usually animals need to be discouraged from displaying sexual behavior towards people either through careful training or simply just neutering. Personally, I think to imply that no animals can enjoy sex either with their own or other with other species is only really possible if you have no understanding of animal sexual behavior. Often the only reason these animals are removed from their true owners is because of these anti-zoo laws. The laws themselves are creating problems that shouldn’t exist in the first place.

2) It is utter rubbish that animals are often injured by sex with humans and in the cases where this does happen it is usually due to the person deliberately trying to cause harm or causing harm due to ignorance. In many cases better understanding could prevent those injuries due to ignorance and better understanding is not gained by banning and criminalizing something which can prevent people finding out the information they need.

Also it only takes a quick look through history to see that criminalizing things does NOT stop them happening, does NOT decrease them and usually only serves to make a situation worse. You have said yourself that the current legal/taboo status can cause problems with injured animals getting prompt treatment they need. Well surely (and I mean this doesn’t take a genius to work this out) that if it wasn’t viewed so negatively these delays would not arise. If you make a situation where people are scared to bring their animals in for treatment, then guess what. they aren’t going to do it.

3) Finally I want to point out the huge flaw in your “but it is for the good of the animals” argument that you use in your last paragraph. If you were up to date with what had been happening in Germany, you would know that Germany already had a law in place to prosecute those who harmed animals either through sexual or non-sexual activity. So this law to protect innocent victims was already in place. The existing law could already be used to target abusers and fencehoppers [trespassers] and maybe could even have been made stricter to better prosecute people convicted of causing this harm. The new law ignores this and is equally or even more devoted to simply targeting those who haven’t ever caused harm. This would seem to be good solid evidence that the new law is not for animal protection (as that law already existed) but simply to enforce morality.

In terms of what you say about having to criminalize all sex with animals to try and prevent the actions of a tiny minority of people engaging in sexual activity with animals I think forgets the basic fundamental fact that this law won’t change anything. Zoosexual people who still love their animals will still have sex with them and the horrible sadists who genuinely enjoy and revel in causing pain and suffering will continue to do so. If we are to take the banning something to prevent the actions of a tiny negative minority then why are we not campaigning to ban sex between men and women to protect women from rapists, domestic abusers and serial killers? Why are we not trying to ban homosexual sex to protect gay men against someone akin to Jeffrey Dahmer? Why are we not banning all pet ownership full stop to protect animals from the few horrifically neglectful owners that exist? I could go on and on with these examples, but it simply points to the same thing. This new law is neither an effective tool to achieve its planned ends and worse it has not been brought in to actually do anything more than subject a group of people to the uneducated moral opinion of others.

I also wanted to add that zoophilia [zoosexuality] is not a choice people make. It is (and is starting to be recognized as such by professionals) a sexual orientation. A zoosexual person can no more choose not to be zoo than a homosexual man can simply choose not to be gay. And yes, it IS an equal rights issue. We live in a world where people who work in animal breeding industries can sexually arouse animals for profit. They can restrain female animals to be raped by a male of their choosing so they can get the offspring they want. They can perform almost any manipulation or mutilation to an animal’s genitals they want if this is done for either profit or for “medical” reasons. These things are viewed as “OK” but a [sexual] act performed for the mutual enjoyment of both parties, and in some cases simply for the enjoyment of the non-human party is viewed as “bad”. Even some of those acts that can legally be performed for profit are illegal if done in a non-commercial situation!” — Ryan D, www.webpronews.com/zoophiles-march-on-berlin-to-demand-equal-rights-2013-02

Sometimes in jurisdictions that have non anti-zoosexual laws, an “animal cruelty” law is unjustly used against someone (even if the zoosexual act did not involve any cruelty or abuse). Animal cruelty laws should only be used against actual acts of cruelty (remember that zoosexual acts are not inherently abusive and can occur ethically — therefore they are not automatically “cruel”); in many cases, a politician will create an anti-zoosexual law and say they are doing for “animal welfare” or to “prevent cruelty”, but this is a lie and is a facade (their REAL reason for prohibition is because of their irrational bigoted anti-zoosexual prejudice — they don’t really

care about animal welfare. If they did they would all be vegetarians and not buy animal products).

In states where zoosexual acts have been unjustly criminalized, zoosexual people commonly disregard the law in what is known as “conscientious objection” (in the same way that people smoke marijuana in a state where it is illegal) — they have sex with an animal because they know there is nothing wrong with what they are doing, and what they are doing is protected by the U.S. Constitution (even if local laws irrationally and unconstitutionally forbid it). They also have sex with animal(s) to protest the unjust, irrational and bigoted laws created to unjustly prohibit their ethical activities. Most of these people hide in the closet because they are afraid of being “exposed”, arrested, turned into a pariah, possibly having to register as a “sex offender” (which is bulls**t) and possibly having their intimate animal lovers barbarically confiscated from them and killed.

In the United States, one of the Amendments protecting zoosexuals is the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (this protection exists in spite of the fact that it has essentially been ignored in the 37 states that have unjustly criminalized zoosexual acts). Here is text from that amendment:

“No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws”

This essentially means that every U.S. state which creates a law criminalizing ethical zoosexual activity is violating the 14th Amendment. In many cases, when a zoosexual person is arrested it becomes like a medieval witch hunt — they are unjustly deprived of their property (pets) (who are living beings with their own rights in addition to being property); these animal companions are their lovers and they are often forcibly taken from their owner and killed — not only does this violate the 14th Amendment, it is cruel and traumatizes both the zoosexual person and his/her animal lover(s). In many cases zoosexual people are also deprived of property when their computers and electronic devices are forcibly confiscated from them by police. In addition, when an anti-zoosexual law is created it deprives zoosexual people of their liberty and does so **without due process**. Zoosexual people have a right to engage in an ethical lifestyle which happens to involve non-abusive interspecies sex (something which is sacred to them and gives their lives meaning) — to take this away from them, make them pariahs, confiscate their animals and prevent them from owning animals is a complete and utter **violation of the 14th Amendment** and is utterly unethical.

These unjust restrictions (and anti-zoosexual laws) are also a violation of the U.S. Constitution’s **due process** clause and **equal protection** clause. Due process is covered in the 5th and 14th Amendments, so anti-zoosexual laws violate both of these Amendments. Anti-zoosexual laws violate equal protection rights because anti-zoosexual laws treat zoosexual differently before the law and discriminate against them based on irrational prejudice and bias. For example, people who perform unethical sexually-oriented “accepted agricultural practices” such as artificial insemination are protected by the law and given special treatment, while zoosexual people (people who engage in harmless and mutually pleasurable interspecies sex) are unjustly

condemned — this violates equal protection because the “equality before the law” principle is violated, and discrimination is aimed at zoosexual people.

So essentially zoosexual people have a **right** to violate unethical and unconstitutional anti-zoosexual state laws (such as unethical anti-zoosexual laws recently created in Washington state, Arizona, Tennessee, Florida and Alaska). They also have a **right** to conscientiously object to these discriminatory and bigoted laws by ethically and non-abusively having sex with animals (values which to many zoosexuals are analogous to religious beliefs). Here are a few quotes which touch upon these ideas:

*“What happens in my bed or barn is between me and my consenting [non-human] partner. [Anti-zoosexual people] are the same type of people who pushed for prohibition [of alcohol] and the war on drugs, and look how f**king well that turned out [...] The only [zoosexual] people that “come out of the closet” so to speak, either have more courage than I could ever muster, or are [a few involuntarily exposed] zoosadists whose derive pleasure from harming an animal. Since the latter pretty much always outnumber the former in what the media reports on, the rest of us [good zoosexuals] get a bad image in the public’s eye”* — 421equinophilo421, [Zoophilia and Bestiality Community](#)

“[The statistics that is] missing includes most [Beastforum users]. The man or women who lives in complete peace with the animal mate of their life. The mate who brings them happiness to them and they to them. They aren’t criminals, they are conscientious objectors to the law.” — Beastlover888,

Here are two quotes by Thomas Jefferson:

“All men [and women] are endowed with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness”

“If a law is unjust, a man is not only right to disobey it, he is obliged to do so.”

Here is a quote regarding the first Jefferson quote:

“I am of the firm belief that discrimination for any reason is bullshit. As long as what you undertake in your pursuit of happiness does not impede on the life and liberty of others, animal companions included, then do as you please” — 421equinophilo421,

The principle in the first Jefferson quote is violated by anti-zoosexual laws because they essentially **prohibit** a zoosexual person’s pursuit of happiness and liberty — if a zoosexual person’s pursuit of happiness involves harmless, ethical, non-abusive, mutually-pleasurable interspecies sexual intercourse with a being who happens to be non-human, this should **not** be prohibited by law — and yet it is in many jurisdictions.

The second Jefferson quote emphasizes civil disobedience — in other words, zoosexual people have a **right** to disobey discriminatory and unfair anti-zoosexual laws (in the same way that Rosa Parks disobeyed unfair racist laws). In addition, zoosexual people have a **duty** to disobey unjust anti-zoosexual laws.

The principle in the first Jefferson quote also happens to be a principle that libertarians adhere to

— the notion that a person should have the liberty do what he/she wants and do what makes he/she happy, so long as it does not interfere/damage the lives or property of others. In addition to zoosexuality, other practices which libertarians believe should be legal include prostitution and marijuana usage.

Ethical, cruelty-free sexual activity between a mature human and a mature non-human animal should **never** be criminalized, and yet it is criminalized in many jurisdictions because of arrogant anti-zoosexual bigots; and as already stated, it is very difficult to get these bad laws eradicated because zoosexuality is taboo, the delusional anti-zoosexual majority are in control, and people who *would* stand up for the rights of zoosexuals are worried that their “credibility” would be tainted. This attitude needs to change, and zoosexuality needs to become socially acceptable (and if this happens, it will be easier to eradicate the bad laws).

And as stated in this section and previous sections, there is plenty of unjust hypocrisy in the law — it is legal to do many things which **really** harm and abuse animals (like slaughter a pig, hunt and kill a deer, use artificial insemination, etc) and yet it is *illegal* in many jurisdictions for a person to have cruelty-free, non-abusive sex with an animal (a sentient being who happens to belong to a different species). The opposite should be true: it should **NOT** be legal to slaughter/kill an animal, and it **SHOULD** be legal to have cruelty-free sex with an animal.

So in other words, it **should be illegal** to slaughter an animal, and it **should be illegal** to hunt and kill an animal — but non-cruel, non-abusive interspecies sex between a human and a being who happens to belong to a different species should be **LEGAL**.

SECTION 13: THE BLOCK QUOTES OF TRUTH

(Image lost)

Above: the LGBT flag alongside the zoosexual flag (with “z” representing zoosexuality). The lowercase Greek letter zeta (ζ) is generally considered to be a symbol of the zoosexual community, probably because zeta and zoosexuality both begin with “z”. It is often used a way for zoosexual people to communicate with each other while at the same time protecting themselves from being targeted by hateful anti-zoosexuals

Before finishing this post, there are several block quotes that caught my attention. Here is the first one (an anonymous Netherlands person referring to a relationship with his dog):
“It’s beyond the question of attraction, it was just love for a single dog at first.

I slowly progressed into becoming sexually attracted towards dogs [...] I’m not insane or anything. I just have a strong devotion of being passionate with my canine lover. As long as he’s in ecstasy, I am. It’s like we’re emotionally attached. Call me species blind or confused. I do often see myself, sometimes, as a female dog [...] After we ever much grew closer, our bond became very much spiritual. It was beyond aesthetic attraction and romance [...] This felt nice to me, knowing he was experiencing pleasure, I felt warm and tingly inside. I soon got warm, I hugged him, surprisingly, I realised he enjoyed this.

It felt so natural, it didn't feel wrong. I know we all may have heard of deviants raping and hurting animals, because they're 'easily coerced' for masturbatory purposes. But I did not have that at all in mind, I'd never force nor harm him with or without sex, I love him." (Quote URL:<http://www.psychforums.com/parap...>)

Also, consider the following block quote of a commenter on a news website:

"Only laws say [zoosexuality] is sick[...] if everyone thought it was good, everyone would do it, but because the laws, morals, and religions make out it is bad (biased opinions), they think its bad [and that it is] only animal cruelty [and] not sexual activity, [yet] empirical data proves animals are happy if they are not physically harmed. Animal abusers are non-zoos and zoos, [and because of this] zoophilia itself [has] nothing to do with cruelty[...] If zoophilia should be banned, so should homosexuality, because [it's] just [as] odd [an] orientation as zoophilia.

I'm afraid to say, being against zoophilia is xenophobic and 'zoophobic', and the law is very unfair for innocent zoophiles, who would never, ever, ever even remotely dream of harming their animal sex partners. [Zoophiles are] unlike these pansexual, sadistic rapists that abuse and rape anything they can get their hands on, whether it be animals or children. Pedophilia is an age (sexual development stage (chronophilic)) preference. So please get your facts right.

I don't feel you can compare zoophiles to pedophiles, because pedophilia is the rape (because pre-pubescent don't consent) of pre-pubescent. Most zoophiles have sex with pubescent, adult animals.

From the core of the online zoophile communities, most of the members of the communities are; calm, civilized, independent, and show no real signs out mental instability, however some suffer depression from the fact they have to hide from those who are 'zoophobic', and 'zoophobic' laws... [zoosexuals are] the innocent people that have deep love, and lust for their animals (because they are also zoophile) and have sex with them just to make their love even deeper[...] [zoosadists are] the non-innocent people that hurt their animals for self-pleasure by inflicting pain (sadism), most often due to sexual reasons... From empirical data I can legally say, and prove that animals are happy and [content] with zoosexuals, just as much, if not, compared to what they are with non-zoosexuals. But [it is] zoosadists that rape them, [and animal victims of zoosadists] are highly depressed due to the fact they are beaten...

An old man used to say to me: Show me why you go against nature, have you forgotten your true purposes, 'homo sapiens'? You can't succeed in evolution without interspecies copulation, and your incest will soon make you weak and feeble.

Well I agree with me, hence my choice for protecting zoophilia. I am not a zoophile, but I will be, if I ever needed to protect them by adding to their masses. Only then the real fightback will begin." (URL for quote: <http://www.truecrimereport.com/2...>)

The reason people tend to frown at zoosexuality is because they have a lack of imagination. They follow the herd, they do what society has taught them to do from an early age, and they don't question it. People tend to say "ewww" and not even approach the subject – this is a result of our anti-zoo culture. The above two block quotes show that there are plenty of people out there who

support zoosexuality – in fact, each of the people who said the above quotes probably represent thousands of people who are too sheepish to reveal what they think on the Internet. Their opinions are drowned out by misconceptions and bigotry, and they hide in the darkness of their zoo closets. They fear that they will be scorned, ridiculed and despised by people if they reveal their zoosexual orientation.

On another website, a person was making many negative accusations about zoosexuals that are common – among them, comparing animals to children, believing that the animals are “forced” to have sex because they cannot consent, and believing that animals need to be “protected” from humans (thus creating an artificial barrier between humans and the rest of the animal kingdom). This person went on to argue that this barrier (the status quo) should remain in place. In response to this, there were several comments that stood out (from 5 different people); this block quote was said by the first person:

“So why do I call Natalie’s response arbitrary? First, she said something about the article with the title saying a dog is as intelligent as a 2-year-old (yes I read that article) equates a dog to a child. I think she meant in reference to the study discussed in the article as the authority and not the title itself (I hope). But even then, if a dog has the reasoning ability of a 2-year-old that doesn’t make the dog an equivalent of a 2-year-old. For one, they’re different species. Two, we’re comparing sexually mature dogs to very young children who are just beginning their development. Three, our society has “Disneyised” animals into asexual children which is very unrealistic. An adult dog is a mature, sexual being unlike a 2-year-old. Also, her argument that a dog doesn’t choose but wants contradicts the scientific studies about canine cognition. They’re not instinctual automats. They’re sentient beings, and although not on par with humans intellectually, still have a degree of rational thinking capacity. True, there’s the issue of -informed- consent. Meaning, they know what they want but they don’t necessarily understand the consequences. But that doesn’t stop us from using dogs for dangerous jobs like police work, hunting (dogs can be cut up bad by a raccoon or mountain lion), or even the battlefield. But when it comes to sex then it’s suddenly different. But why? It’s so arbitrary.

The dynamics of the relationship is an understandable concern for those who don’t understand how a sexual relationship with a dog works...the sexual drive is a biological drive just like for us humans and sharing that with a canine partner hurts no one. Dogs need to be protected in a similar way to children, but that similarity is no stronger than the similarities between the two species. Do we put children in kennels? Do we put them in crates? Do we arrange breedings between 2-year-olds in order to improve their breed’s genetic line? Of course not, that’s just silly. It’s double think to make them identical when we’re talking about sex and then make them different when it’s convenient.”

Another commenter said the following:

“I am a female zoosexual, in a relationship with a male dog. I believe this to be an orientation. Growing up, I was always closer to animals than to my peers. Nature fascinated me; my first crush was on a cartoon horse and my first awareness of my own sexual arousal came when I watched goats mating. My earliest fumbling attempts at sexual contact during puberty were with male animals I knew. I cannot turn it off and see no reason why I should.

I would like to address the concept of consent. Yes, my animals take a submissive role in the household. They are not capable of making the decisions necessary to keep them healthy and well. I have the responsibility of providing them with nutritious food and appropriate veterinary care, with making sure they are groomed, free of parasites, and not permitted to roam at large. This is what I must do to ensure their safety. Many of these things are not to their preference. They would much rather have free run of the neighborhood, avoid annual vaccinations, and eat as much human food as they could fit in their stomachs. I ignore their consent in all of these areas, and yet this is considered the model of good dog ownership.

So...can my male consent to sex, in this context? Asking that is like asking a Lab if they can consent to playing "Fetch", while the dog is standing in front of you with the ball in his mouth and hopping from foot to foot in excitement. I have made it clear to him that I will only tolerate his sexual advances when in the bedroom. The result of this edict is that anytime I walk towards the bedroom door, he bolts ahead of me and then bounces eagerly at the door, begging to be let in. If I don't want to play, I have to be very careful to exclude him from the room, as he will get on the bed and then refuse to be dislodged from it until he's had his fun.

We don't argue about "informed consent" when dog herd cows, run agility courses, detect bombs, or retrieve birds, all for our convenience or pleasure. So why is it suddenly an issue when sex is involved?"

A third commenter said this:

"Sex to me as a zoophile is the ultimate acceptance. It is the animal accepting me as one of its own kind in its own fashion in the most basic of physical functions. In this, it automatically precludes forced sex and sex with mates that are not sexually mature.

Human society has forced superiority over domesticated animals in every aspect of their lives. A breeder of livestock has the right to stimulate males to collect sperm, artificially inseminate females to fertilize, supervise (assist/forced) animals having sex, dictate life, dictate which animals will be used for food, segregated from birthing parents, hold in artificially small pens, castrate, notch ears, pin ears, dock tails. But if someone derives pleasure from sexual stimulation of the animal, we have crossed the forbidden barrier of morality. This is what I have a disagreement with[...] Just as long as we are clear that just because a human has had sex with an animal does not mean physical abuse has occurred.

So let us go to our justice system's principle of exactly that. What exactly is the abuse that is occurring to these poor retched animals that are suffering under the hands of zoophiles? Zoophiles care about these animal lovers, and take precautions to use veterinary grade lubricants, be clean of diseases, and even prevent the infiltration of dirt and prevent the introduction of infection. As a matter of fact, it can probably be said that because of a zoophile's attention to their animal mates, they are more likely to seek veterinary care for their animal companions providing a higher standard of care than many pet owners."

A fourth commenter said this:

“It is very likely that the state laws in this regard exist mainly because of religious tradition and unclear thinking. People cannot fathom that animals are capable of seeking sex, consenting to sex [,] and pleasure itself.

Animals are not humans. They will never be expected to hold conversations about ethics, hold a 9 to 5 to support the wife, 2.5 children, dog and 2 cars. Their world is mentally much simpler than ours. Ethics, guilt, law, psychology and sociology are all human inventions. The fact that we can choose to not do something we wish to do is irrelevant. This ethical touchstone is completely artificial and inapplicable. What is applicable (via Occam’s razor) is that animals can choose to have or not have sex and can choose to seek or not seek sex.

A two year old human cannot: survive in the wild; mate and produce viable offspring; work for a police department to find things such as bombs, drugs, missing persons, perps and the like; help the disabled function in society; consent to sex; seek out sex; and engage in agility and speed competitions with others of its kind. Clearly, dogs (when they reach maturity) have the capacity to choose to seek and participate (consent) to sex [...] While there are zoos who do seek social acceptance, in my experience, they are the vast minority. And yes, their quest may well speak of an isolation they may feel. Most zoos, however, would instead seek to be left alone in their pursuit of happiness, without the fear of religiously motivated laws killing their loves and ruining their lives.”

Finally, a fifth commenter said this:

“We don’t spay or neuter human adults, or human children. We would call that mutilation. When mature, we freely allow humans to pursue sexual relief, by themselves or with a partner.

At the same time, we freely allow, even encourage, the same wholesale mutilation of all animals, especially pets, for (what must be our) selfish reasons, since one can assume the animal does not want to be mutilated and his opinion on the subject is not consulted nor valued.

In the case of whole, non-mutilated animals, do you think it is more reasonable, to freely allow them to pursue sexual relief, as we allow for humans, or must we lock them up, separate them, and deny them sexual relief? In one case, they suffer sexual frustration, in the other case, they do not. Which is more reasonable? If the answer is to spay and neuter everything with legs, then why not spay and neuter ourselves as well? Is this choice arbitrary?”

In response to all of these comments defending zoosexuality, the anti-zoo person said the following:

“I [admit that I] was projecting what it means to ME not to have sex with animals. And to another point that since an animal cannot forego what it wants, I would reject a love/sex relationship with it. That’s also a projection of my own choices. My judgment that it is not good for people’s psyche to have sex with animals is obviously based on my own imagined experience of how it would it make me feel if I did it.”

(URL source for 6 above block quotes: <http://blogs.browardpalmbeach.co...>)

The anti-zoo’s response indicates that the arguments she made against zoosexuality were not sound. In the end, it wasn’t really about society, or about consent, or about animal cognition – all

it was about was how she personally felt about it – and that was probably due to the fact that she grew up in an environment which discourages zoosexuality. As a result, there seems to be a cyclical cycle of unending irrationally about zoosexuality.

This is a segment from a discussion which happened during the summer of 2012:

“[Lovingpegasister]: I’m a young 20-year-old woman [a pansexual zoosexual]. Since I was young, I’ve been attracted to animals emotionally, romantically, and sexually. Is this normal? Is it wrong? I love animals as much as I love people, and I would never hurt one, but I’ve had sexual contact with a dog once when I was [young] and home alone at a relative’s house. It wasn’t forced, and I’m embarrassed to admit it[...] The dog was very happy after our sexual play was over, and seemed to want more[...] I’m also sexually attracted to dolphins, pigs, and horses too[...] I feel weird for what I am, and it hurts living in a society where people you know would disown you and call you a sicko for being a zoophile... I struggle [to] accept myself for what I am[...] I’m pansexual, so yeah, I like people too, I just also happen to like animals[...] I find more beauty in animals than people[...] I find humanity to be evil because of all the wrong in the world that [it has done] that’s worse than what happens in nature. [...] IMO, I don’t think it [sex with animals] should be “wrong” if the animal decides to get sexual and the human lets them[...] consent is mainly a human invention[...]

[RESPONSE by Basilisk]: Certainly society would have us believe it’s wrong – zoophilia is a relatively well-known and widely stigmatized [sexuality], as I’m sure you’re aware. Try not to hate yourself though! [...] It’s good that you’ve found someone who shares your [zoosexual feelings] – I think that can be really beneficial toward self-acceptance and such. [...]

[RESPONSE by anxious 58]: Those dogs [in a video] never look happier than when their female [human] owner lets them put [their sex organs in her]. Dogs don’t view sex as “sacred” like our society does. They do it because they want to and can’t be emotionally harmed by it. Many people would think it is just “sick”. But that is an **emotional appeal**, not a feeling based in logic. [...] “Bestiality” is sadistic sex with animals (i.e. harming them); [however, since you] **love** them it’s zoophilia [and] not bestiality.[...] Because society is still based on Christian dark ages morality, it may be illegal to have sex with animals where you live.

[RESPONSE by Xena]: For your own safety, be careful who you discuss this preference with. [...]

[RESPONSE by Lovingpegasister]: I guess you could say I have some sort of OCD-related problem as while I have no reason to worry, my worries about **someone finding out** about my zoophilia turn into anxiety attacks, stress, panic attacks, and depression. I know I shouldn’t feel that way, but when society’s [hostile] views on taboo subjects like zoophilia are ingrained into your head that such attractions are wrong, disgusting and something to feel deeply ashamed of, it’s hard not to beat myself up over it.[...] Zoosexuality is difficult to explain other than I really love animals and in a different way than the average pet owner and animal lover.[...]

[RESPONSE by bramble26]: I don’t think [zoosexual activity] is all that uncommon.[...] I have viewed “zoo porn” or whatever from time to time, [and] nothing turns me on more.[...] I have an attraction to larger dogs and horses[...]

[RESPONSE by Snakeskinsoul]: as long as you are behaving in an ethical manner... for example, not forcing yourself on anyone or anything, not purposefully harming them, etc... then it [zoosexual activity] is not wrong. [...] We're conditioned as a society to feel [guilt and shame], but that doesn't mean what you're doing is wrong. [...] [Your situation] is unfortunate. There's a wide difference between people who engage in sexual activity with animals that enjoy it [mutually], and people who force an animal into something when the animal is obviously frightened or angry; if you're part of the former group, then you shouldn't be treated as a criminal or as a psycho.[...] Mating between species that cannot reproduce is quite common. Dolphins especially will pursue animals that aren't dolphins, and there are many instances of dogs, goats, elephants and other animals trying to "get some" from other species. [...] Legal consent is also a human concept. If they are both human concepts, then it really doesn't matter, and all that matters is the safety and well-being of all parties involved.[...] [I don't like people who say] how fun it is to hunt animals, how tasty meat is, how nice this-or-that leather items is... and then bark about how having mutually enjoyable sex with an animal is "immoral". [...] We can't have it both ways.[...] Humans are "just another animal", so a human having sex with a dog or horse or narwhal is no different than a dog having sex with a goose or whatever.[...]

[RESPONSE by lovingpegasister]: What really hurts the most is that I prefer animals over people and I have to lie about my sexuality and hide in the closet pretending to be something I'm not. I wouldn't go around blabbing to everyone I know that I had sex with a dog, but it'd feel great to get it off my chest and say that I like animals emotionally and romantically without the possibility of [becoming an outcast] or forced to see a psychiatrist for it [or arrested].[...] Animals CAN say yes or no, just not like people do. Animals know what they want and if they're horny, they'll try to get what they want.[...] Animals also can't consent to factory farming, artificial insemination, skinning while alive, hunting for sport and decapitated and mounted on a wall as a trophy for all to see, being raised in puppy/kitty mills, exploited for use in dangerous jobs, castration[...] do all of that, and that's "humane" and "natural", but consensual sex with an animal? Suddenly it's "oh so wrong" and people cry foul.[...] According to those [who think zoosexual acts are "wrong" because they don't produce offspring]: I guess gays, asexuals, and lesbians were never meant to mate because if they were, they'd produce offspring.[...]

[RESPONSE by zoopoint]: Animals don't have this cultural system that enforces taboos on certain things. They don't really care a whole lot of what species they mate with. [...] [in response to an anti-zoosexual person]: I find it amusing that you say I do not understand animal behavior when I have done nothing but correct you thus far, while you have rather rapidly degraded your argument to **ad hominem**s.

[RESPONSE by Snakeskinsoul]: [To those who think zoosexual activity is "animal abuse"]: If the animals are sexually mature and not being harmed [via a sex act with a human], it's not abuse. If the animal trusts you to not hurt them and you don't, it's not abuse. It is not sexual abuse if there is no abuse done, and if there is no harm done then there is no abuse. Comparing [zoosexuality] to pedophilia is highly inaccurate, as a pedophile is attracted to a human child that is **not sexually mature**... mentally or physically. A two-year-old dog is not the same as a two-year-old child[...] Telling people that their lifestyles are "dirty" or "vile" when there is little proof of harm done is quite insulting." — <http://www.psychforums.com/parap...>

This block quote addresses some of the other fallacies relating to zoophilia:

“In much of the world bestiality is illegal. Even in my liberal state of Washington, if someone “Knowingly engages in any sexual conduct or sexual contact with an animal,” it is a considered “Animal cruelty in the first degree [and it] is a Class C Felony,” which is a “maximum penalty [of] 5 years in prison and [a] \$10,000 fine.” Is this justified or is it just another form of irrational prejudice?

First I would like to point out that humans are animals. So, in Washington State, because of how the law is worded, Washingtonians cannot even legally have sex with other humans! However, I doubt anyone will be charged with a Class C Felony because they had sex with their spouse. (“But judge, it was our wedding night!” says Jennifer after being sentenced to 5 years in prison for having sex with her new husband.)

Seven common arguments against bestiality (in no particular order):

- 1. It is unnatural. Therefore, it is wrong.*
- 2. It goes against God’s will. Therefore, it is wrong.*
- 3. You could contract an STD. Therefore, it is wrong.*
- 4. If you had sex with something like a horse, it could hurt you badly. Therefore, it is wrong.*
- 5. Animals cannot consent. So, it is rape. Therefore, it is wrong.*
- 6. It is disgusting! Therefore, it is wrong.*
- 7. Only a pervert would want to do that! Therefore, it is wrong.*

The first argument listed is an appeal to Nature. You cannot appeal to Nature because She is neither moral nor immoral: She is amoral. This is an overused logical fallacy. It is like Hume’s is-ought problem. The Naturalistic fallacy, as it is sometimes called, is part of the fact-value distinction.

The second argument is for religious fundamentalism. It is about mandating, possibly by law, what one’s religion says its followers should do. If your religion tells you to do something, like only have sex within marriage, you should not hold people who are not part of your religion to the same standards as the people in your religion for keeping its laws.

If the third argument was followed to its logical conclusion, you would have to conclude that sex between humans is also wrong; because, as we all know too well, humans can pass on STDs to other humans as well. Just because someone chooses to do something that is dangerous, even life threatening, that does not mean that thing is inherently wrong.

*The fourth argument is flawed because it assumes danger, even if an individual consciously chose to partake in it, presupposes wrongness. If that were true, though, skydiving and bungee jumping would both be immoral. Like John Stuart Mill said in *On Liberty*: “the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not sufficient warrant.”*

The fifth argument is flawed because its premise it is based on is incorrect. Some non-human animals can consent. For instance, if a woman lets her dog give her oral sex, it is consensual. The dog could choose not to lick the woman's vagina, but the dog continues. Having sex with, say, a chicken, though, cannot be consensual and it would probably harm the poor bird. So in some cases it can be consensual, but surely not with all cases.

The sixth argument is the yuck-factor. It is a type of appeal to emotion, which is a logical fallacy. Just because you personally find something disgusting, it does not necessarily mean that thing is wrong. Disgust does not imply wrongness. Poop is disgusting, in my opinion, however, that does not mean poop is inherently wrong.

The seventh argument is an ad hominem argument. It is fallacious because it derives its conclusion from an insult and not deductively from the premise(s).

If someone looked objectively at the case, one would find that this norm, this phobia, is surely not justifiable, especially when it comes to making laws banning bestiality. The religious have a claim that can be justified for themselves, only within their religion, but they should not impose their religiosity onto others. The rest of the arguments, however, are classic fallacies.

So let's end this irrational prejudice!" — Time and Existence blog,

<http://www.timeandexistence.blogspot.com/2011/12/look-at-arguments-against-bestiality.html>

And lastly, consider this block quote, which was in response to a question about zoophilia:

"As an atheist who believes in logic, reasoning, and rational thinking, I must say that the statements in your paragraph are logically correct. I completely agree with what you've said there, as well as the statements following it. Zoophilia is about two living beings—one human and one non-human—loving each other to the point of becoming mates to each other, often including sexual intimacy as a natural extension and expression of that love and affection. Interspecies sex and mate ship is a natural part of nature's species, even if rare, and humans are animals just the same as any other species. (I hate it when people argue that humans aren't animals. I just want to say, "what are you then: a plant or a rock?").

Anyone who brings up the "animals can't/don't consent" argument apparently know nothing about nonverbal communication, body language, or the interpersonal communication between mating animals. Animals in nature give or withhold consent to sex and mate ship all the time; that's what happens when one individual propositions the other individual to win him/her as a mate and sex partner, and the other individual chooses to either accept the sex and mate ship from that individual or to reject it and go with someone else. The lack of speaking a human language is not a valid argument; look at how often sex between two humans who don't speak a word of each other's language happens. Gee, did he rape her because she didn't speak the English word "Yes"? No, of course not because her arms pulling him close, her kissing lips, and her passionate moaning of pleasure indicate that she fully wanted and enjoyed their lovemaking. Animals give consent through nonverbal communication such as flagging of a tail, display of sexual arousal, presenting the genitals, willing acceptance of foreplay and sexual activity, vocalizations and calls of invitation and pleasure, and so on. Very often consent and desire is shown with no vocalizations at all.

Animals withhold consent and communicate that through vocalizations of growling, whinnying, or whatever noise the particular species makes; turning around to face the individual offering, moving away, walking away, or running away; flattening of the ears, baring the fangs; biting, clawing, and kicking; and even outright attack if it becomes necessary. Any human who would push things that far and get hurt fully deserves it; any human who wouldn't even notice or understand that communication is a blind and ignorant moron; and any human who would ignore that lack of consent and proceed with sex anyway is a rapist no matter the species or gender of the victim. To me, a rapist should be strung up by their gonads regardless of the species of their victim. And IMO, those who would rape someone (human animal or nonhuman animal) that results in injury or especially death deserve to be executed. The "animals can't consent" argument is clearly, logically invalid. Animals are fully capable of giving or withholding consent; it's the human who acknowledges or ignores it.

The "it's illegal" argument is also invalid because (1) it's not illegal in all places around the world, (2) all of those existing laws come from religious dogma and/or kneejerk reaction to something that happened and get put in place with no rational thought to its validity, (3) many societies and cultures around the world, and certainly many individuals, are perfectly accepting of humans having a nonhuman animal mate or sex partner, and (4) being illegal certainly doesn't stop people from being zoophile, because it's an in-born sexual orientation, or from being sexually active with an animal mate, because it's a private matter that they keep private.

"It's gross" is not a valid argument either because that's just a matter of personal opinion. To me, eating yogurt is gross, but I certainly have no place or interest in stopping others from doing it. To many people oral sex is gross as could be, but to those who love it it's a beautiful, intimate, and delicious thing to share with their partner and certainly nothing that should be prohibited just because someone somewhere thinks it's "gross." Personal opinion of "gross" is not a valid argument against zoophilia.

And of course, religion is not a valid argument against it because religion is a personal belief, and personal belief is the same as personal opinion. Everybody has different religious beliefs, even if those beliefs are very similar to someone else's and even if their beliefs are that there is no religion, god, etc. With thousands of established religions around the world and many denominations and variations within each, and with religion being based on belief of the intangible, to say one's religion prohibits zoophilia is like saying Santa Claus wouldn't like it so you better watch out. Different people believe different things and one person's beliefs shouldn't dictate the beliefs or life's actions of someone else.

[When a person is] in a zoophilic/zoosexual relationship between a human and animal(s), whether they are mate in love or just good close trusted friends, when everyone involved is fully consenting, [the result is that participants] enjoy the pleasure shared, [and are] happy with it when it's done; [if] nobody gets hurt, there's nothing wrong with it logically or spiritually. It is far better to share love and affection than hate, control, or contempt." — Sky,

<http://www.answers.yahoo.com/que...>

SECTION 14: CONCLUSION

The more I read comments from these various people, the more I realize something astounding – throughout the world, there are probably thousands upon thousands of zoosexual people who think just like these people, but can only describe how they feel using fake names on the comments sections of websites, and on online discussion forums. On the website [Zoophilia and Bestiality Community](#) alone there are more than 1.1 million members, and that number is growing rapidly. These zoosexual people live second lives – if they merged their hidden lives with their real, public lives, they fear that they would be condemned by society.

Commenters such as the ones above (and other Internet-based outlets) are the only way people can hear the voices of zoophiles in our current, strict society. They bring up many valid points. For example, the common argument against zoosexuality is a lack of consent – yet there is no consent at all when a person neuters an animal or hunts it.

The following comment reflects this idea:

“It [sex with animals] should be legalized, love is love and you shouldn’t discriminate against anybody’s lifestyle choices. And don’t give me crap about ‘consent’ – [people] can kill these beautiful creatures without [their] consent for food and sport, so why should [consent] be required to make sweet inter-species love to them?” — Poems, <http://answers.yahoo.com/question...>

Also, mentioned throughout this post is the idea that many animal rights advocates erroneously believe that having sex with an animal is *automatically* animal abuse; plenty of evidence suggests that having sex with animal **is not** automatically abuse (in a few cases it is abusive, but most of the time it is not); the following comment reflects this idea:

*“Many animal rights [activists] [those who condemn zoosexuality] say they want what is ‘best’ for animals. This is a load of crap because what they really want is what they **think**, or have made an uneducated decision about, what is best for animals. Many of these people have little to no knowledge about animals and animal behavior in the real world and will happily overlook anything that doesn’t coincide with what they have convinced themselves is ‘right’. I find it best to ignore people like this[...] The most important thing is to live your life how you want, and just make sure you’re not deliberately harming anyone or anything else. Other people’s [negative] opinions of your [zoosexual] life shouldn’t mean anything.”* — Dirtbiker2000

Remember what Martin Luther King said:

“The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort or convenience, but where he stands at moments of challenge and controversy.” — Martin Luther King Jr.

As the above quote states, if a person knows something is right and defends it (even when it is unpopular), it shows that the person is good. Zoosexual people who defend ethical (non-cruel) sex with animals are good because they are defending something that is right, even though it is unpopular. Through reconciliation, many closeted zoosexuals who previously hated zoosexuality have learned to accept themselves for who they are; those people have made peace with themselves and live enjoyable lives because they are comfortable with their zoosexuality and know there is nothing wrong with it.

An unknown author once said, “Don’t think you’re on the right road because its the well-beaten path”. This quote emphasizes the fact that just because something is taboo doesn’t necessarily mean it is wrong, even if the majority of people believe it is. By conforming to what the majority is doing, you do not guarantee that what you are doing is correct. Ultimately, the reason taboos exist for topics such as zoosexuality is because those subjects are “out of the way”, for all of the reasons listed in this essay — conformity, social stigma, health, welfare, etc. If life were a mountain and all the things considered to be normal were on the main trail, then the taboo subjects such as zoosexuality would be off the trail. If you have hiked, you know that while going off trail may be risky, it can also be fulfilling as well. This may ultimately be why taboos exist; from one culture to another, whether universal or not, people tend to follow the herd instinct.

Keep in mind what Anatole France said: “If fifty million people say a foolish thing, it is still a foolish thing”. What this means is that just because a vast majority of people believe something should be a certain way doesn’t mean that it is correct, and when unconventional ideas attempt to unravel the fabric of the majority’s beliefs, it results in retaliation, aggression, and the labeling of certain subjects as “taboo”.

Remember: zoosexual people are **born** with zoosexual feelings — it is a sexual orientation that they **cannot change** (in the same way that a gay person is born with homosexual feelings). It is unethical to deprive a zoosexual person of happiness by condemning who they are and unjustly criminalizing their lifestyle.

Consider this quote by a zoosexual:

“If we [zoosexuals] show the world that we do have love in our hearts and our intentions are in the right place, that should at least satisfy a big portion of the population.” —

Thewildstallion77, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>(Link no longer exists)

Also, consider this quote by another zoosexual:

“I am a zoophile and I could not be further from the stereotype. I have been a vegan for nearly 5 years, I have been a vegetarian for three times that, and I have a Ph.D in Physics as well as being a member of PETA. And it angers me greatly when people say that [zoosexual people] want to only “hurt” the animal, and [when people say that] they don’t care for their welfare – I

care for the animal! I'd do anything I could to prevent cruelty. I give my companions the best life I can possibly give them, [and there is nothing wrong with non-cruel interspecies sex involving a human]" — Eezliaz, [http://blogs.scientificamerican....](http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/bering-in-mind/2010/03/24/animal-lovers-zoophiles-make-scientists-rethink-human-sexuality/)

For many people, compassion for animals and zoosexuality are a core part of their belief structure and their spirituality, and it gives their lives meaning. As discussed in Section 12, laws which prohibit ethical zoosexual sex are unconstitutional because they violate the spirituality of these people. For these zoosexual people, engaging in ethical inter-species sex with a being who happens to be non-human is a sacred and spiritual part of their existence — these people care more about the animal's welfare than they do about their own. Many zoosexual people believe that non-human animals have souls just like humans, and that non-human animals should be treated as equal to humans in terms of moral consideration and interests (see [zoosexuality as part of a spirituality](#)).

Based on what I've learned over the years about zoosexuality, I've compiled a list which summarizes this post and my conclusions about zoosexuality ([link here](#)) — and a [list of zoosexual links](#) that do not contain anti-zoo bias.

Ultimately, **it's OK to be zoosexual, just as it's OK to be homosexual or bisexual. There is nothing wrong with zoosexuality.** Humans **are** animals, and humans are just another species in the Animal Kingdom (despite their intellect). Any rational person should realize that sexual intercourse between a human and non-human animal **is not intrinsically wrong**. Whenever our irrational culture makes claims that sex with animals is immoral, or that zoosexuality is an “illness”, **do not believe it**. Just as *certain kinds* of human-human sex are bad (i.e. rape), the same is true for human-animal sex — **but that does not mean that all human-animal sex is bad**. Only a few zoosexuals abuse animals; most zoosexuals **deeply love and care** for their animals. Additionally, **there is no link between zoosexuality and pedophilia, animals can non-verbally consent**, and zoosexual relationships can be **mutually pleasurable**.

It is incorrect to assume that **all** zoosexual acts are “cruel” and “abusive”. Sexual activity between humans and non-human animals usually does **not** involve cruelty. Not all zoosexual people are good — some are “zoosadists” and some are “bestialists” (have sex for the sake of having sex). Zoosadists and bestialists treat animals like “sex toys”. **However**, most zoosexual people **are NOT like that**. Most zoophiles **are ethical** and treat their animals with extreme care and devotion (these people usually form romantic relationships with their animal lovers). Many of these zoosexuals are also vegetarians and animal rights activists.

Remember this quote from earlier in the post:

*“This case [a man who was aroused only by images of horses] and related anecdotal evidence reported by the authors were important at the time because they suggested that zoophilia may be an extraordinarily rare—but real—type of minority sexual orientation. That is to say, for some people, having sex with their animal “lovers” may amount to more than just substituting human sex with the next best thing. Rather, for them, sex with nonhuman animals **IS** the best thing.”— blogs.scientificamerican.com/bering-in-mind/2010/03/24/animal-lovers-zoophiles-make-scientists-rethink-human-sexuality/*

The above quote shows that most zoosexual people have a zoosexual **preference** — in other words, they **prefer** to have sex with non-human animals (sometimes a specific species such as horse) and are not sexually attracted to humans. But in addition to this, some people are sexually attracted to humans AND other animal species.

ZETA zoosexual rights organization member Michael Kiok said it best: *“We [zoosexuals] see animals as partners and not as vessels for gratification.”*

Here are several principles that should be followed:

“Compassion for animals is intimately connected with goodness of character; and it may be confidently asserted that he who is cruel to animals cannot be a good man [Arthur Schopenhauer]. Consider the wellbeing of an animal companion as important as your own, if not even more than yours. Place the animals will and wellbeing ahead of your desires for sexual gratification. Teach those who seek knowledge about zoophilia and bestiality without promoting it. Discourage [zoosexual sex] in the presence of fetish seekers. Reject and speak out against sexual exploitation of animals for the purpose of financial gain. Reject and speak out against those who practice and promote animal abuse [which may or may not involve sexuality]. Never do anything with other people’s animals, especially not against the will of its owner.”— Gregordiesel, <http://www.beastforum.com/showto...>

People should treat non-human animals the way they treat other humans. People should adhere to the following ethical principle: Non-human animals should not be exploited for financial gain, they should not be killed and/or slaughtered, they should not be harmed, and they should be free to have sex with animals of other species (and one of those “other species” is humans). Interspecies sex is interspecies sex, regardless of what animal species is involved. People should be tolerant of zoosexuals; they should also become vegetarian in order to demonstrate compassion for animals. The “purest” zoosexual is one who is vegetarian/vegan and places animal welfare and the well-being of animals above all other interests (the “animal” category includes humans). Killing animals (whether for meat or a different purpose) is unethical and wrong, but a human who has sex with a non-human animal is **not** unethical and **not** wrong (in the same way that it is not wrong for a lion to have sex with a tiger). People need to realize that human’s life is just as valuable as a whale’s life or a dolphin’s life or a cow’s life. Humans are intrinsically the same as other animals, and thus humans (and other animal species) should be treated with the same respect. All advanced animal species (including humans) should be given the same value and the same moral consideration. Humans are not “above” other animals, and thus we humans have a duty to be compassionate to other animals (See [this post: people are too anthropocentric](#)).

People need to continue to blur the “line” between humans and other animal species (because the “line” between humans and other animals never existed in the first place — it is a human invention and a social construction). From a naturalist point-of-view, humans are not distinct from other animal species — humans are in the same category as other animals.

Again, there is nothing wrong with zoosexuality. Ultimately, zoosexuality **is not intrinsically immoral.** Interspecies sex between humans and other animal species can occur **ethically** and in a **non-cruel** manner. It is also important to remember that zoosexuality is **more than just sex** — zoosexual people form emotional and spiritual bonds with animals that go beyond just sex. Perhaps over time, people will be **desensitized** to zoosexuality and will begin to realize that there is nothing wrong with it. In the past decade, thanks to the Internet, acceptance of zoosexuality has grown a little bit; but it still has a long way to go. Hopefully, in the next 20-30 years, zoosexuality will become fully accepted by society and will no longer be considered taboo. But this will depend on whether zoosexual people will have the courage to stand up for what they believe in, both on and off the Internet.