

On animal intelligence and cognition

https://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2016-08/aaft-dub082916.php

Dogs understand both vocabulary and intonation of human speech

“ Their results reveal that, regardless of intonation, dogs process vocabulary, recognizing each word as distinct, and further, that they do so in a way similar to humans, using the left hemisphere of the brain. Also like humans, the researchers found that dogs process intonation separately from vocabulary, in auditory regions in the right hemisphere of the brain. Lastly, and also like humans, the team found that the dogs relied on both word meaning and intonation when processing the reward value of utterances. “

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/canine-corner/201303/which-emotions-do-dogs-actually-experience>

Which emotions do dogs actually experience?

https://m.huffpost.com/us/entry/us_8398778?ec_carp=9043585633868026677

<https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2017/09/dog-brain-feelings-mri-gregory-berns/>

Dogs Have Feelings—Here's How We Know

Dogs have a broad range of emotions with individual variations of what causes them, despite not having words for them. It's being found that animals have deeper cognition than previously thought.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352154616301991#bib0125>

Integrating social ecology in explanations of wolf–dog behavioral differences

Dog domestication was not a one-way road; proto-dogs made social and behaviour choices to benefit from humans and cooperate.

<https://phys.org/news/2017-09-stsr-dogs-self-awareness.html>

STSR tests confirm that dogs have self-awareness

A new study carried out by the Department of Psychology at Barnard College in the U.S. used a sniff test to evaluate the ability of dogs to recognize themselves.

<https://lorrieshaw.blogspot.com/2015/04/dogs-predictive-behavior-cues-human.html>

A dog's mental capacity is more sophisticated than previously thought, study indicates

They've demonstrated that their mental abilities are on par with that of a 2-3 year old child, but in one area, dogs leap ahead: their ability to pick up on when they are being misled.

New studies consistently demonstrate that nonhuman animals know and process a lot more than what humans believe they can, with each new finding surpassing expectations and demoting previous comparisons.

<https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2009/08/dogs-think>

“The upper limit of dogs’ ability to learn language is partly based on a study of a border collie named Rico who showed knowledge of 200 spoken words and demonstrated ‘fast-track learning,’ which scientists believed to be found only in humans and language learning apes,” Coren said.

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/animal-emotions/201506/pigs-are-intelligent-emotional-and-cognitively-complex>

Pigs are Intelligent, Emotional, and Cognitively Complex

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168159116302192>

Horses can learn to use symbols to communicate their preferences

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/killer-whale-learns-imitate-human-speech-dolphin-voice-a8185931.html>

Killer whale learns to imitate human speech

Orcas imitate some other animals and have their own dialects.

On animals having sex for pleasure

<http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/crux/2015/08/03/animal-sex/#.XCEcUrpMHDs>

Yes, Other Animals Do Have Sex For Fun

Sex serves other social purposes for animals, on top of pleasure; with orgasm, same-sex relationships, and seeking mating even when one is not fertile, it is obvious that they don't do it just for reproduction.

<https://sciencing.com/animals-besides-humans-mate-pleasure-8390317.html>

Animals Besides Humans that Mate for Pleasure

"While it's difficult to ask them if they enjoy doing the deed, a quick look at their behavior shows that, at the very least, most mammals and birds experience sexual pleasure."

"It's a common misconception that animals only have sex in heterosexual pairs and only when the female is fertile."

<http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20140613-do-animals-have-sex-for-fun>

Do animals have sex for pleasure?

Animals will seek pleasure in sex regardless of whether they can reproduce or not; it is socially and evolutionarily a good thing.

On animal sexual behavior

<http://koryos.tumblr.com/post/55022432802/all-right-guys-here-it-is-the-big-gay-animal-sex>

Koryos' post that explains more about animal sexuality in itself (no mention of zoophilia). They also study animal behaviour.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animal_sexual_behaviour

Has several bibliographical references

<http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20130221-the-wilder-side-of-sex>

The wilder side of sex

Humans may look down upon certain sexual interests as odd or gross, though chances are that animals indulge in a spot of similar behaviour too.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4048177/>

Social Variables Affecting Mate Preferences, Copulation and Reproductive Outcome in a Pack of Free-Ranging Dogs

"Unlike wolves, most free-ranging dogs exhibit a promiscuous mating system in which both males and females mate with multiple partners (e.g. [79], [80], [81]). "... Nevertheless, some evidence suggests that mutual mate choice might affect mating and reproductive outcome in domestic dogs. Several authors reported that bitches mate with certain males while refusing others [79], [80], [81], [85], [86], [87], [88]. At the same time, males are attracted more to females in their second or subsequent oestrous periods than they are to females in their first oestrus [86]."

Info on how dogs choose their mates and communicate their consent.

https://www.vet.upenn.edu/docs/default-source/research/equine-behavior-laboratory/86reprodu.pdf?sfvrsn=f95fe0ba_0

Reproductive Behavior of the Stallion

Info on how horses show interest in partners and interact sexually.

Books, essays and insights

https://www.zotero.org/groups/2265366/zoophilia_research_material/items

Extensive bibliography on zoophilia books and papers.

<http://fifine.org/whitefangsTexte/72-Englisch.html>

Human Sexual Contact with Animals / New insights from current Research

by **Andrea Beetz** at the University of Erlangen, Germany

Has myriad statistics, not a long read.

<https://www.amazon.com/Understanding-Bestiality-Zoophilia-Hani-Miletski/dp/0971691703>

<https://forum.mobilism.org/viewtopic.php?f=126&t=2451539>

Understanding Bestiality and Zoophilia by Hani Miletski (1999-2002)

at the Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality in San Francisco

Though a 20 year old study, and a 200+ page read, it's one of the most thorough studies you'll ever find on the subject. (I believe there were at least some pages with excerpts on the internet, but some were rid of the content for copyright.) Written by a sexologist on the field, includes interviews and a few statistics accrued from people she personally met, along with stats from a huge questionnaire to almost 100 people who have had sex with animals.

<http://drmiletski.com/index.html>

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290839852_Is_zoophilia_a_sexual_orientation_A_study

Is zoophilia a sexual orientation? A study

by **Hani Miletski**

This directly refers to the questionnaire from the above study.

<http://humanbehaviors.free.fr/References%20-%20Articles/Zoophilia%20in%20men%20%20A%20stud%20of%20sexual%20interest%20in%20animals.pdf>

Zoophilia in Men: A Study of Sexual Interest in Animals

by **Colin J. Williams, Ph.D. and Martin S. Weinberg, Ph.D.**

This article presents a study of 114 self-defined zoophile men who were researched primarily through the use of an on-line questionnaire. We describe how the participants acquired the identity label of zoophile, what it meant to them, and their relationships among themselves. Also examined are how they eroticized animals and how human and feral characteristics combined to form this object choice.

Finally, participants' sexual profiles with animals and humans, and how the balance of animal and human desires creates different forms of zoophilia, are described.

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2185469

The Bestiality Proscription: In Search of a Rationale

by **Antonio M. Haynes**

Addressing a taboo rarely discussed in scholarly works, this Article analyzes frequently advanced arguments supporting prohibitions on bestiality. Though on a superficial level the arguments seem appealing, upon closer inspection the standard justifications break down under internal inconsistencies.

<https://uniquelydangerous.com> - [pdf containing the first 17 chapters](#)

Reporter Carreen Maloney spent years seeking the real story, ultimately uncovering a secret society of zoophiles who form their main social, emotional and physical bonds with animals. Uniquely Dangerous sheds light on a worldwide social phenomenon that dares not venture from the shadows.

Maloney's site about her book, where she investigates the case of Douglas Spink, who was demonized by media; the truth isn't quite like that, as she finds out.

"This book is dedicated to the animals who are killed by humans when their secret lives with zoos are discovered."

<https://www.utilitarian.net/singer/by/2001---.htm>

An insight from an utilitarian & ethics philosopher, Peter Singer.

<http://fifine.org/whitefangsTexte/86-Englisch.html>

<http://avoiding-rape.tripod.com/id2.html>

Analyzing Bestiality

An essay with further links about zoophilia, done for a college class on philosophy/morality by Sarah Wheeler.

<http://pale-blue-knot.tumblr.com/post/87373461746/welp-time-to-come-clean-recently-i-earned-my>

An insight from a zoo with a Master's Degree in evolutionary animal behaviour. ([saved cypaste](#))

<http://www.adjectivespecies.com/2012/02/06/zoophilia-in-the-furry-community/>

Zoophilia in the Furry Community

An article by JM on zoophilia as a sexual orientation, which major scientists/philosophers have given more of a voice to cast a light on the topic, and discussion of ethics and tolerance about the community.

<http://theangrylionshark.tumblr.com/post/94860990446/zoophilia-the-facts>

A brief post regarding zoophilia and therianthropy.

(deactivated source)

Is zoophilia a mental disorder?

How the view of this has changed and professionals don't think so. ([cypaste here](#))

-

General speciesism

<http://animalrights101.tumblr.com/post/127303395372/my-interest-in-the-ethical-issues-surr-ounding-the>

An excerpt from David Livingstone's *The Politics of Species* (2013) regarding speciesism. ([cypaste here](#))

<https://www.amazon.ca/Are-Smart-Enough-Know-Animals/dp/0393246183>

(book) **Are We Smart Enough to Know How Smart Animals Are?**

From world-renowned biologist and primatologist Frans de Waal, a groundbreaking work on animal intelligence destined to become a classic.

-

News and reports

<http://www.exberliner.com/features/zoophilia/>

Zoophile: Animal Love in Berlin

Reporting on animal sex and zoophiles in Berlin (includes abusive+exploitative report).

<http://sciencenordic.com/denmark-moves-ban-bestiality-sex-animals-really-so-bad>

Denmark moves to ban bestiality -- but is sex with animals really so bad?

Is bestiality harmful to the animals? Not always, say Danish researchers and point to the fact that animals seem to enjoy sex and orgasms.

https://www.vice.com/en_uk/article/qvm8q5/why-people-have-sex-with-animals

Why People Have Sex With Animals

Dogs and horses are the preferred partners by a landslide.

Sites

www.zoowg.net

Community forum

<https://www.zeta-verein.de/en/>

ZETA Society in Germany. Although the acronym ZETA means “Zoophiles for the Ethical Treatment of Animals”, this German community has additionally acronymed their site’s ZETA as *Zoophiles Engagement für Toleranz und Aufklärung* (Zoophiles Engaging for Tolerance and Awareness).

<https://blog.zeta-verein.de>

The official blog for the above site; site in German.

<https://www.zoophile-gegen-vorurteile.de>

“Zoophiles against prejudice”; page in German.

<http://www.fifine.org/zoofaq/zoo-faq.htm>

The “Zoo FAQ” by Michael Kiok; page in German.

<http://www.animalzoofrance.net/index.php/accueil>

Animal Zoo France, a wiki for zoophilia; site in French.

Videos and documentaries

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zfJCnWW0bUM>

ANIMAL LOVERS - Interview with a Zoophile

Interview with Oliver Burdinski, a German citizen with a male Siberian Husky partner called Joey, who is his top.

<http://www.coffeeandcelluloidproductions.com/project/dolphin-lover/>

Dolphin Lover

A short, acclaimed documentary about Malcolm Brenner’s affair with a female dolphin (this man also appears in other links here)

Zoophile examples & experiences

https://www.reddit.com/r/animalromance/comments/14ctu3/this_is_shadow_my_first_lover_story_in_comments/

This is Shadow, my first lover / (Woman/Black male Shepherd dog)

A woman’s experience experimenting with and losing her virginity to her guard dog, who became a boyfriend to her. [\(broken link\)](#)

<http://vicemag.tumblr.com/post/94438674103/mans-best-friend-with-benefits-oliver-burdinski>

https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/mans-best-friend-with-benefits-0000407-v21n8

(Man/male Siberian Husky dog)

Although the article seems to be gone now, here is what was left from VICE’s tumblr post:

Oliver Burdinski is fighting for the right to have a relationship with his dog. His purebred Siberian husky, Joey, is his sexual partner. And while some of his fellow Germans might reel at the prospect of intercourse with another species, Burdinski is open to discussing the taboo of being a literal animal lover. Just don't use the word bestiality.

"I don't like this word because it's often misleading and used in different cases," Burdinski told me.

Burdinski first realized he was a zoophile while growing up with a German shepherd—his family dog. He was responsible for taking care of the creature, which lived in his bedroom. Around the age of 14 or 15, the young man started exploring his sexuality with his companion. He remembers being more attracted to the dog than to humans but felt rather alone with such desires. After living without a dog for a decade, Burdinski began dating men and women. He settled down with a long-term girlfriend until 1995, when he got an internet connection. That's when he discovered forums and chat rooms devoted to the zoophile community. Soon thereafter he broke it off with his human partner (they've remained good friends). Burdinski realized he could never be happy in a traditional relationship.

Oliver is also present in a video interview whose link is above.

<https://jezebel.com/a-chat-with-malcolm-brenner-man-famous-for-having-sex-1685059436>

(Man/female dolphin)

Watching Dolphin Lover, I was struck by the sincere, troubled and complicated intimacy with which Brenner recalls these events, which took place when he was only 19.

Interview.

Brenner's book about Dolly, [Wet Goddess](#)

[His site](#)

<https://nymag.com/scienceofus/2014/11/what-its-like-to-date-a-horse.html>

What It's Like to Date a Horse / (man/female horse)

By Alexa Tsoulis-Reay

Here, a 42-year-old man from Canada describes his life as a zoophile attracted to female horses.

https://www.academia.edu/14553334/GUIDE_TO_SEX_WITH_DOGS_AND_FAQS

GUIDE TO SEX WITH DOGS AND FAQ'S + A Guide To Canine Sex (man/dogs, woman/dogs)

How to avoid health issues and injury, what acts can be mutually enjoyed, etc

(broken link)

-

-

Misc.

<https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/bering-in-mind/animal-lovers-zoophiles-make-scientists-rethink-human-sexuality/>

Animal Lovers: Zoophiles Make Scientists Rethink Human Sexuality

<http://www.equinelibertysports.com/blog/why-petting-your-horse-is-good-horsemanship/>

Why petting your horse is good horsemanship

Observations on why bonding with a horse is beneficial despite the long-standing belief that, for training purposes, it's better to keep a professional and hands-off approach

<https://www.refinery29.com/amp/en-us/2019/03/226061/fake-sex-doctor-damian-jacob-markiewicz-sandler>

The Summer Of Scam Continues Into Spring With This Fake Sexologist

Dr. Damien Jacob Markiewicz Sandler, a prominent sexologist who's been featured everywhere from Forbes to Dan Savage's Savage Love podcast, is not a sexologist after all, according to an investigation published by Gizmodo.

(...)

Sendler made a name for himself by presenting studies about topics that are "practically tailor-made for outlets that cover taboo sex news," writes Gizmodo. VICE interviewed him about his study on bestiality; Playboy quoted from his paper on

necrophilia; MEL Magazine covered his study comparing the "traumatic rectal injuries" in humans who practiced anal fisting — or, as Sendler put it, "butt-fisting" — to those who "had anal sex with animals."

On general interspecies

<https://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/03/070314-hybrids.html>

Working hybrids in nature

<https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/japanese-macaque-has-been-spotted-trying-have-sex-sika-deer-1600283>

Ape trying to mate with a deer

Copypastas referenced in other parts of this document and/or for safekeeping.

(Pale Blue knot's essay)

Welp, time to come clean: Recently I earned my master's degree on (evolutionary) animal behaviorism. I'm well aware of how *equipped* I am to contribute to the zoophilia discussion, as huge as that discussion is. I don't think I'm gonna be the guy who publicly makes a stance about zoophilia outside of this account - my family works in the public sector and I live in The South - there's too much for me to lose. A (hopefully less trans-phobic) Zoo Dan Savage is inevitable, but outside of the protective wall behind my Dear Coketalk-esque anonymity, I'm relatively closeted.¹ That said, I have a few things to say about it, so I'm finally putting them in one space on this blog.

The short answer is yes, animals can consent to sexual advances. The part that gets argued against is that animals cannot consent to the context of sexual activity in terms of human society. Put another way: dogs can say yes to getting their junk played with, but they can't consent to the gravity of that situation as an exchange of trust and other information as modeled between inter-human sexual relations in human society, i.e. "There's no way a dog understands what's going on".

The pro-zoo stance is, Well, of course they don't - and that's fine. Animals can and do consent to what is happening to their bodies - and at times will extremely enthusiastically initiate further sexual interaction. But they can't possibly consent to what sex means to a human person, and all the metadata attached to such.

That is often where the parallel to pedophilia is drawn in most anti-zoo arguments: Animals are like children! They don't know what's going on! But the difference between zoophilia and pedophilia is very, extremely real: The parts of sexual activity that the dog, for instance, does not understand will not in any way harm or even affect them in any way (unless their owner gets tried for anti-bestiality laws and is put down as a result or whatever (or worse in even lesser developed countries)).

Children, however, have actual real trauma inflicted on them when sexually abused, or given sexual activity before they have the correct amount of information to deal with the feelings they invoke.

A, for instance, dog, again, doesn't have that sort of trauma. They do a thing that feels good and that's it, that's the endgame, they did it, it was rad, tail wags for everybody. If things were done to them without their consent, then clearly abuse has occurred, and they may shy away from or become violent towards any future sexual advances, or to all human interaction in general, and that's awful, and that too should never happen.

There are three big issues attached to interspecies sexual relations that I'll touch on here: 1. consent, 2. conditional or conditioned consent (particularly in domesticated animals), and 3. metaknowledge - the 'unknowability' of the thoughts inside another creature's brain (the "known unknowns" w/r/t the thoughts existing in the minds beings outside oneself).

I've already covered the brunt of the first one: the ability to consent is present in non-human animals for the sex parts, but the parts that [uniquely only humans find important](#)² are not present in a dog's mind, and that's okay.

The second issue - conditional consent - is a little trickier: For the past 30,000 years, dogs have been bred to want to please their owners. Through selective breeding, their main M.O. is Make Human Pleased. Is it a feedback loop, then, when a human has sex with a dog, that the dog is happy because the human is happy as a result of said sex? Is the very nature of consent of any action, sexual or not, completely corrupted by the presence of domestication? This issue doesn't have a concrete answer - not a provable one, at least, in one direction or the other.³

So on one hand, we have legally-recognized "non human persons" such as apes and dolphins, animals we've proven to have human levels of intellect, regularly initiating sexual contact with humans - so it is possible dogs are capable of consenting despite being biologically conditioned to want to please humans in general. Betrayal of trust is a thing that has been observed in plenty of animals before, so there is a "breaking point" (which is an awful extreme to use as a metric, but important to note nonetheless) in how much humans can get away with in terms of inducing discomfort in a dog or another animal. But the act of sex is fundamentally pleasurable to literally most every creature on the planet - and as such, producing oxytocin and dopamine in a dog in the form of an ear scratch, or that tenfold with a knot-tug is, biologically speaking, indistinguishable. So giving them raw pleasure in the form of sex can't be classified as abuse in this model of thinking, but whether or not that pleasure or consent is modified, intensified or even invalidated completely by our extensive breeding of them for their people-pleasing behavior is in fact arguable.

The last part, the unknowability of others' thoughts, is more philosophical than scientific in my opinion, but still important enough to warrant a sound argument against interspecies relations. Since the brain of, again for instance, a dog, is so different than that of a human's, can we really 100% know that they are saying yes to sexual advances? This falls apart when you start getting existential about it, w/r/t the sovereignty of self in even inter-humanrelationships - when you have sex with an adult woman, can you really be 100% sure she is

actually truly consenting, even if she says yes? You can never know because you are not her, so you have to trust her - but that percent of how sure you are will never be a true 100%.⁴

A philosophical zombie [...] is a hypothetical being that is indistinguishable from a normal human being except in that it lacks conscious experience, [qualia](#), or sentience. For example, a philosophical zombie could be poked with a sharp object, and not feel any pain sensation, but yet, behave exactly as if it does feel pain (it may say “ouch” and recoil from the stimulus, or tell us that it is in intense pain).

– [Wikipedia’s entry for Philosophical zombie](#)

With dogs, the percentage of absolute certainty that “yes, they are saying yes (through canine body language and excitement) to these sexual advances” is likely closer to 100% than the percentage that a fellow human means yes when they say yes (due to sheer complexity of societal and emotional variables, mores, intellect, and, well, brains) is to 100%.

But the fact that it’s not exactly 100% is enough for people to urge folk to err on the side of caution and not to diddle their dogs - but it’s a bit of a straw man argument, since that percentage between humans and other humans will never truly be fully perfectly 100% for any action, sexual or not. There is un-disprovable doubt that the other person might be lying when they consent to said action. Again, this is much more philosophical than scientific, but still an important point to ponder.⁵

But then, as a final note: the amount of things we do to animals nonconsensually, is (clearly) (obviously) abhorrent. On the softer end: does a dog consent to having their nails clipped? I can say with 100% certainty that there are plenty of dogs that don’t, but I’ve clipped them anyway. This is a power exchange problem, obviously, since we’re taking on the “humans know best” stance,⁶ but then there’s the whole farm mills and slaughterhouse scenarios and what have you, and those are more obvious - though unuseful - points when used to discuss zoophilia. A better way to frame that part of the discussion is to make comparisons to how forced breeding practices, for artificial insemination, are “fine” for humans to perform as long as it’s for making babies or for sport - but, if you do the same practice and a human derives human pleasure from the act - where the animal is clearly unaware of the difference (semen collecting stations for stallions, for example), then it’s suddenly a moral issue, which is frankly hilarious.

And real quick, I’d love to direct your attention to a GLORIOUS twitter account called [@CantBePorn](#). It uses some common anti-zoo sentiments and reframes them as captions for photos of animals being manipulated for artificial insemination, or just photos of big ole animal dingedangs. It’s amazing at knocking down the hilarious loops people jump through to make their logical fallacies seem reasonable - for example: “This is natural sex between horses! But they aren’t consenting! A vet needs to castrate them so they can’t do icky things like this! #cantbeporn”

In conclusion: Be nice to animals or I will... I’ll... beat you up?

(And note that sometimes “being nice” may in fact mean tugging on a big ole dog’s big ole knot and they will in turn show their gratitude for your handiwork with so many kisses.)

-
1. That is to say, the people who matter the most know of my zoosexual orientation, and of those that raised a fuss were a [self-solving problem](#). ↵
 2. Glibness of that comic aside, those uniquely-human values placed on a sexual contract exist for good reason, as acting on a sexual contract *with another human that exists in human society* is a big deal - but a big deal specific to *humans*, not to animals. ↵

3. The [recent studies with dogs trained to sit still in MRI machines confirming they have emotions](#) (things behaviorists and dog lovers have known for basically forever) are promising in that regard, but we still simply [Need More Data](#). ↵
4. See also notes on [Probability Theory](#) and the [Dichotomy Paradox](#) - i.e., *One can never be completely 100% sure of anything ever*. Blue pill, red pill, &c &c, no, no, stop that, *put that fedora down this instant I s2g*. ↵
5. For further reading on *the nature of consent* and *can animals feel feelings* and other intense philosophical issues regarding animals as food and other related subjects (not even in a politically charged [vegan slant](#), but in a “how do animal brains work” think-piece) I highly, highly encourage [David Foster Wallace’s essay Consider the Lobster](#). It isn’t the first, and will be far from the last time I link to it on this blog. ↵
6. However it’s now coming to light that [the rote castration practices that humans perform on domesticated animals in the States directly results in higher rates of various health problems](#), so the “humans know best” power exchange should be viewed as skewed at best. ↵

(Excerpt from Jesse B.)

“It’s foolish, however, to assume that religious morality isn’t still woven into modern bestiality laws (even the term “bestiality” is religious, first appearing in the King James Version of the Bible in 1611 to falsely cleave apart human beings from all other animals). We’re a peculiar species, but humans are animals too, of course.

Bestiality is expressly illegal in most countries today, and in those places where it’s not an officially codified crime, people who have sex with animals are still occasionally prosecuted under animal cruelty laws. As a platonic animal lover, I’m in favor of protective laws. The sad reality is that there are indeed hideous sexual deeds done to animals by a few demented people. Yet there are also cases of human-animal sex that don’t involve any obvious harm to the animal and may even involve mutual pleasure.

Which is worse, for instance, a stud manager forcibly collecting the semen of a prized racehorse by “electro-ejaculating” the animal for commercial gain (which involves inserting an electrified rod into the animal’s rectum and delivering a high-voltage shock to its prostate) or a zoophile gently masturbating his companion horse with the sole intent of bringing it satisfaction? That the first is perfectly legal and the second illegal shows that bestiality laws are more concerned with a person’s sexually deviant desires than they are with the animal’s actual harm. When the question of harm is an afterthought in any sex law, we need to rethink both its fairness and how it’s handled by the courts. There is the problem of an animal’s inability to give verbal consent. But note that many zoophiles prefer to be the passive recipients of the animal’s actions upon—or more often inside—them. That’s still completely illegal, even in cases of volitional thrusting (think humping dog to human leg), which seems to imply the animal is more or less on the same page with the zoophile.

Funny enough, that equally thorny problem of how to gain an animal’s verbal consent before it’s killed for one’s personal dining pleasure doesn’t inspire nearly the same degree of outrage. Not that either is great, but if I were a bovine, I’d rather get “humanely” penetrated by the penile equivalent of a stiff strand of hay than be “humanely” slaughtered by seventeen-inch steel blades.

(I think I might have to draw a firm line with all this at juvenile goats, though. They’re just kids, for God’s sake.)”—

Jesse Bering, “Perv: The Sexual Deviant in All of Us”

(Excerpt from B-Word Spells D-Day,

Carreen Maloney)

**Maloney is an investigative journalist, animal welfare activist and rescuer; scroll [up](#) for her book on a case of zoophilia in her site, where she comes to sympathize with them and their care for animals.*

<https://uniquelydangerous.com/2013/01/02/b-word-spells-d-day/> (before deletion)

Amid the heated debate about “animal rights”, it is important to note what often happens to the animals in these cases. A grim reality. Dark truth that might even be covered up.

When animals are taken from zoophiles, they are frequently killed by those who seize them. According to data from numerous cases, giving them “better lives” often means ending their lives.

The animals are viewed as unfit to live because they are a reminder of the “offence to human dignity” that occurred. Or, they might be characterized as deranged sex machines inexplicably capable of sexually assaulting human beings. A danger to civilized society.

Similar comments were made about Doug Spink’s animals in 2010. On one forum, for example, a frequent poster said this on June 9:

“I must remind readers that all of these animals were trained and conditioned to engage in sex with men on a frequent, regular basis, that is the reason none of the male dogs are neutered and none of the stallions were gelded. These animals are probably not suitable for pet homes, even after neutering they would retain inappropriate behavior people would find disturbing. In some cases involving bestiality, the animals involved were deemed best to be euthanized due to behavior issues.”

The following day, the poster continued with her written attack upon the animals.

“It wouldn’t be a pretty scene owning this horse, or dealing with people’s jokes and innuendos about owning a horse trained for sex with men.”

I met eight of Doug Spink’s eleven animals after they had been taken from him. They were not demented.

These animals — like those from other cases involving zoophiles — are marked because they have had sex with human beings. And then they are sometimes snuffed out because of it.

Is that really about saving?

(A Broken Record, Carreen Maloney)

<https://uniquelydangerous.com/2013/01/09/a-broken-record/> (before deletion)

You might not want to accept that society’s hatred and rage towards zoophiles extends to their animals.

Instead, you might prefer to believe a glittered storyline that these animals are all “rescued” from the zoos, and transported to a better life.

FACT: *The animals often get killed in these cases.*

If it sounds like I’m repeating myself, that’s because I am. And I am going to keep repeating myself until people start to listen.

There is something about these animals that makes people want to kill them. To rub them out. Destroy who and what they are.

They are considered defiled. And yes, “an offence to human dignity.”

I can't say I completely understand it yet.

Sometimes the killings are used to torture the zoophile — as in, “She didn't go down easy.”

The most horrific story I have heard so far is widely known and discussed among zoos, although I haven't been able to get firsthand confirmation of it yet. It dates back to the 1980s, and it tells of a man in the northern United States being discovered as a zoophile. His mares were gathered together, and he was forced to watch while the authorities burned the mares' genitals off with a blowtorch. The horses suffered a slow, agonizing death over several days.

Another example comes from James Michael Tait. I have the letters Tait wrote to Doug Spink from his jail cell. Tait was arrested in October 2009 in Maury County, Tennessee. Spink reached out. His support of Tait, and the letters and phone calls they exchanged, would help play a part in Spink's downfall, as they were later used as evidence against him in the 2010 court proceeding in Seattle.

Excerpts from letters written by James Michael Tait to Doug Spink:

Oct. 31, 2009

As far as the farm, no one is watching it — being that they've confiscated everything with four legs from the property. They euthanized (sic) it for Kenny — but it still means the same thing as far as the disposition of all of the animals. They've murdered them — with the claim; all of those animals were too dangerous to be around people now. Bullshit. They received the death penalty: their crime — just being our close friends. Friends that both cared and loved each other. (How true, that they're all dead is real or not — it is what the officials told Kenny)

Nov. 23, 2009

This whole mess is tearing me apart, day after day. Every day, I think of what they've done to all of the animals, it sends me into deep emotional pain. All they ever did was to be our friends — to connect with us and bond — for that, they received death! I just wish this would all just stop, to go away, leave us in peace — instead, they inflict suffering.

With a very heavy heart,

Jim

(Climbing Trust Mountain, Carreen Maloney)

Before I interviewed the zoo people, I assumed it was the potential destruction of their lives that was stopping them from coming forward. Loss of jobs, friends, family ties, and social standing. Loss of acceptance and respect from their communities. Potential jail time.

But I was wrong. Dead wrong. The real reason the zoos live in fear is something altogether different.

Unexpected on the surface perhaps, until you really think about it.

Each one of them is terrified that someone will come and take their animals away if the reality of who they are is made known. Possibly — even probably — taking them away to die.

That's one thing I want to say right off the bat to the animal rescuers who are reading this. In most cases, to most people, this issue really isn't about saving the animals. Not in the end it isn't. Because the anecdotal evidence suggests that the animals are usually killed when the truth is discovered anyway.

Just by their continued existence, these animals are viewed by society as “an offense to human dignity.”

At the bare minimum, even if their lives are eventually spared, whether to kill these animals or not is always a big part of the debate that ensues — isn't it better to just kill them, these creatures who have **had sex** with a human being? Shouldn't they be exterminated because they are now a danger and a menace to civilized society?

I don't agree with that argument. Are you a danger and a menace to society after you have had sex?

*(Excerpt from The Politics of Species,
David Livingstone Smith)*

“My interest in the ethical issues surrounding the use of non-human animals grew out of my investigations into the phenomenon of dehumanization- the tendency to conceive of groups of people as creatures that are less than human. Dehumanization is a common feature of war, genocide, slavery, and other atrocities (Smith, 2011). Its purpose is to disinhibit violence against the dehumanized group by excluding them from the universe of moral obligation.

Dehumanization raises deep metaphysical and ethical questions about the human/non-human binary...

[...]

...Speciesism is parasitic on the category of “species”. It refers to the moral privileging of certain biological kinds... [I]t is generally supposed that “human” straightforwardly refers to the species *Homo sapiens*, and therefore that “human” is a name for a biological kind. If this assumption is correct then it provides a clear basis for demarcating humans from non-humans. Only *Homo sapiens* are human, and all other species are non-human. But what if this isn't correct? If “human” and “*Homo sapiens*” are not equivalent terms, then this upsets certain suppositions about the human/non-human dichotomy as well as the moral implications that supposedly flow from them.

[...]

What is it to be human? ...[T]he dictionary gives us three options (*Homo sapiens*, some proper subset of genus *Homo* that includes *Homo sapiens* among its members, or all of genus *Homo*); the scientific literature presents us with even more. Although for the most part paleoanthropologists identify humans with *Homo sapiens*, or with the genus *Homo*, some restrict it to the subspecies *Homo sapiens* or enlarge it to include all of the hominin lineage (for a range of views, see e.g. Leakey and Lewin, 1993; Falgueres et al., 1999; Potts, 2003; Schmitt, 2003; Lewin and Foley, 2004; Mikkelsen, 2004; Pollard, 2009).

These differences of opinion are not due to the scarcity or ambiguity of empirical evidence. They are due to the complete absence of such evidence- or, to put the point with greater precision, the absence of any conception of what sort of evidence would settle the question of which primate taxa or taxon should be counted as “human”. Biological science can specify, with a reasonable degree of accuracy, the taxon to which an organism belongs, but it cannot tell us whether an organism is a human organism. The epistemic authority of science does not extend to judgements about what creatures are human because “human” is a folk category, not a scientific one.

[...]

...Claims like “an animal is human only if they are a member of the species *Homo sapiens*” are stipulated rather than discovered. Neither you nor anyone else has sifted through the available data (what data?) to emerge with the finding that humans are *Homo sapiens*. Rather, in deciding that all and only *Homo sapiens* are humans, you are expressing a preference about where the boundary separating humans from non-humans should be drawn (Clark and Willermet, 1997; Corbey, 2005; Bourke, 2011).”

+

The Politics of Species (2013) -Chapter 3 (Idexically Yours: Why being human is more like being here than like being water)- David Livingstone Smith on the politics of human identity and “human” as a social construct and folk category versus a biological fact. // Part I.

“We exclude other animals from the moral community by conceiving of them as essentially different from ourselves.”

(anon to ask-a-zoosexual:

You guys have a disease, why don't you get help?)

Hi anon, thanks for your suggestion. Yours is a remark zoosexuals hear quite often, and for a long time it was indeed the general accepted attitude that all sexual orientations (except straight human-human) were considered as something deviant that had to be cured. So, when you would have suggested this therapy in the 1960s, I probably would have agreed with you.

However, the psychological and psychiatric attitudes towards zoosexuality have changed, and this is reflected in the description of ‘zoophilia’ in the DSM (the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, published by the American Psychiatric Association or APA). The DSM is regarded as offering the criteria for the classification of behaviour as ‘normal’ or as a ‘mental disorder’. Legislators and policy makers - including the World Health Association - refer to the DSM to formulate policy. In other words, the DSM is the authority on the classification of human behaviour.

The first edition of the DSM, the DSM-I was published in 1952. The DSM-I described bestiality and zoophilia as ‘sociopathic personality disturbances’. Of course anything sociopathic is something that has to be treated and preferably cured, so your suggestion would have been received with a standing ovation. The world moved on though.

The DSM-II (published in 1968) did not mention anymore the term ‘zoophilia’, but reclassified bestiality under the heading of ‘Personality Disorders and Certain Other Non-Psychotic Mental Disorders’. Yes, bestiality was still regarded as a disorder, thus also in the late 1960s people would have accepted your suggestion. The world moved on though.

In its description of bestiality, the DSM-III (from 1980) replaced the term ‘sexual deviation’ with ‘paraphilia’, which is a collective medical term for ‘abnormal sex with socially unaccepted stimuli’. This is where your suggestion starts to lose ground: even though the term ‘paraphilia’ suggests that something is socially unacceptable - a taboo as you will - it does not suggest that the behaviour is something that has to be cured, as long as it can be managed. In the 1980s researchers made distinctions between so-called zoo-exclusives and those who had both human and nonhuman (sexual) partners, arguing that bestiality is only a paraphilia when the individual in question is zoo-exclusive. The term ‘zoophilia’ returned in the DSM-III as still a mental disorder. The DSM-III suggests that the preferred nonhuman partner is of a nonhuman species with which the individual had intense contact during childhood. I disagree with this assumption because there are many zoosexuals who always have been attracted to certain nonhuman animals regardless of whether they grew up with these species of nonhuman animals. Anyway, let’s continue our voyage through the DSM. After all, the world moved on.

The revised version of the DSM-III (published in 1987) and the DSM-IV (published in 1994) did not categorise zoophilia as a disorder by itself because ‘zoophilia is never a clinically significant problem by itself’. I repeat: ‘zoophilia is never a clinically significant problem by itself’. Can you feel your suggestion crumbling away? As long as zoosexuals know how to maintain an ordinary life, a non-mainstream sexual orientation is not a

problem that has to be cured. Anyway, in the revised DSM-III and the DSM-IV, zoophilia was categorised under the label 'paraphilia not otherwise specified'. And still the world moved on.

The DSM-V (published in 2013) does not mention bestiality or zoophilia at all. What it does mention though, is that paraphilia disorders are something that should be relatively common, must cause serious harm to the individuals or others, and must possibly be considered illegal. Why would the APA decide these categorisations do not apply anymore to bestiality and zoophilia? I think this is because some recent studies - for instance Donofrio's study from 1996 and studies by Hani Miletski (see also the clips on this site) and Andrea Beetz in the 2000s - pointed out that human-nonhuman sexual contact is not a clinically significant problem. Many studies on bestialists and zoophiles since the 1940s only recruited research respondents (or objects) from among institutionalised offenders. The resulted in a skewed representation of zoophilia and bestiality and the assumption that zoophiles and bestialists portray also other sexual deviant behaviour. After all, these institutionalised offenders were institutionalised for many reasons, and these studies rarely mention how many of these research objects actually were incarcerated because of sexual involvement with nonhuman animals.

Independently from each other, Miletski and Beetz were able to speak with people who were not incarcerated and who considered themselves to be zoosexuals or zoophiles. Findings of Miletski and Beetz suggested that zoophilia / zoosexuality are not disorders you can cure, but in fact genuine sexual orientations, similar to being straight, gay, lesbian, or bisexual. A sexual orientation consists of three aspects: affectional orientation, sexual fantasy orientation, and erotic orientation. These all applied to Miletski's respondents and Beetz' respondents. So here you have it: the perception of zoophilia / zoosexuality has changed since the DSM-I of 1952, and right now studies suggest zoophilia / zoosexuality is a genuine sexual orientation in its own right. This means that, just like being straight or being gay, being zoosexual is not something you can cure. Of course, when your sexual orientation causes issues to yourself or others (e.g. rape), then there is a valid call for therapy to contain that behaviour. However, giving a blanket statement that all zoosexuals are abusers and that therefore zoosexuality has to be outlawed is just as irrational as arguing that all human-human sexual contacts have to be outlawed because there are rapists about. Miletski and Beetz were among the first ones to argue that in itself, zoosexuality is not a problem for the human animal and the nonhuman animal involved. Society might not approve of zoosexuality, but - as we pointed out in other answers on this site - 'not liking something' is not a valid reason to prohibit something or to suggest that therapy is needed. The world has moved on since 1952, I do hope society moves on as well.

Thanks for reading and have a nice day.

M-yL

I would just like to jump on and add that my highly trained (20+ years, PhD in clinical psychology) therapist who I was seeing for other issues examined my zoophilic leanings. I told her everything, btw. Her statement was "There is no need for any treatment here." So no disease to cure I'm afraid.

-F