

**Understanding
Bestiality and Zoophilia**

By

Hani Miletski, Ph.D., M.S.W.

Copyright © 2002

East-West Publishing, LLC

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the author.

ISBN: 0-9716917-1-1

Second Printing, 2002

Printed in the U.S.A.

Cover design by Arthur Goldberg Designs

Published by East-West Publishing, LLC: Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

DISCLAIMER

This book is for adults only. It's about sex. It's about sexual relations with animals, and it contains explicit descriptions about sexual behaviors. The subject matter may be offensive to some people. If you think you may be offended by the subject matter and/or by explicit descriptions of sexual behaviors between humans and animals — don't go to the next page. Close the book and send it back for a full refund.

The book was not intended to offend anyone, nor was it intended to encourage anyone to have sexual relations with animals. The purpose of the book is to merely report what others reported to the author and to increase the knowledge base of the phenomena of bestiality and zoophilia. The author does not advocate sexual relations with animals, but merely wishes to present the subject as a form of human sexual behavior.

Neither the author nor the publisher shall be liable or held accountable for the reader's feelings or actions precipitated by exposure to the ideas or activities described in this book.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have written this book without the help and support of many: “Chris,” my client, was my inspiration for the study on bestiality and zoophilia. The late Mark Matthews wrote *The Horseman* which really touched me. “Beverly,” Remus, “Jim,” “Ted,” and Stasya opened the door for me to the zoo (short for zoophiles) community, persuaded their zoo-friends to participate in the study, and gave me advice. The participants in the two Focus Groups which I facilitated in order to gather ideas about what to ask in the questionnaire. All the zoos who have contacted me with their warm words, encouraging and thanking me for doing the study and writing the book. And most of all, the individuals who took the time to fill-out 23 pages of 350 questions about their most intimate (and often secretive) issues. This book is dedicated to all of you.

As I was doing the study and writing my doctoral dissertation, I had the three best committee members I could have wished for: Jerry Zientara, Ed.D., Judy Seifer, R.N., Ph.D., and Robert Phillips, Jr., Ph.D.. They were always there for me, reading, over and over again, my long chapters. They encouraged me, gave me words of advice, and even helped me find rare literature.

My fellow colleagues from the Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality, Raffaele Donofrio, Ed.D., Ralph Bruno, M.A., and Robert Lawrence, Ph.D., provided guidance and helped me gather data about different aspects of zoophilia and bestiality. And the Editor of *The Wild Animal Revue* lent me several rare books and ran my ad in the magazine without asking anything in return.

My friends and colleagues, Annette Owens, M.D., Ph.D. and Cathleen Glass, M.S.W. read the manuscript and provided me with invaluable comments and suggestions on how to make the book better. And my loving husband, Arthur Goldberg, encouraged and supported me while helping edit this endless manuscript.

I thank all of you from the bottom of my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROLOGUE 1

SECTION I LITERATURE REVIEW..... 4

CHAPTER 1 **DEFINING SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ANIMALS** 5

CHAPTER 2 **BESTIALITY AND ZOOPHILIA THROUGHOUT HISTORY AND IN VARIOUS CULTURES** 8

Prehistoric Times 8

Ancient Near East 8

Ancient Egypt 10

Ancient Greece..... 11

Ancient Rome 12

The Middle Ages in Europe 14

The Renaissance Period in Europe..... 17

Europe in the Modern Era and Today 19

South and East Asia and Oceania..... 22

Arab Countries, the Middle East, and Africa 25

South and Central America 27

Native Americans, Canadians and Eskimos..... 29

The New World — The American Colonies..... 30

The United States of America 31

The Internet..... 35

CHAPTER 3 **THEORIES AND OPINIONS** 37

Bestiality/Zoophilia from a Mental Health Point of View 37

Why do People Engage in Sexual Relations with Animals? 41

Prevalence of Bestiality/Zoophilia..... 46

Animals’ Consent..... 49

Animals’ Cross-Breeding..... 51

Bestiality and the Art 52

CHAPTER 4 **STUDIES CONCERNING BESTIALITY AND ZOOPHILIA**

Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin (1948)..... 55

Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard (1953)..... 56

Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy and Christenson (1965)..... 57

Rosenfeld (1967)..... 58

Grassberger (1968 in Dekkers, 1994) 59

Waine (1968) 59

Trimble (1969)..... 60

Dumont (1970)..... 60

Hunt (1974)..... 61

Monter (1981) 61

Zillmann, Bryant and Carveth (1981) 62

Davies (1982)..... 62

Story (1982) 62

Peretti and Rowan (1983) 62

Liliequist (1988)..... 63

Morris (1988)..... 63

Cameron, Cameron and Proctor (1989) 64

Leal (1989)..... 64

	Alvarez and Freinhar (1991)	64
	Cerrone (1991)	65
	Penyak (1993)	65
	Donofrio (1996)	65
SECTION II	MY OWN STUDY ON	
	BESTIALITY/ZOOPHILIA	66
CHAPTER 5	FINDING SUBJECTS/PARTICIPANTS	68
CHAPTER 6	FOCUS GROUPS.....	70
CHAPTER 7	THE RESEARCH PROJECT.....	83
	The Questionnaire	83
	Methods	83
CHAPTER 8	GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PARTICIPANTS	85
	How did the Participants Find Out About the Study? (Question 1)	85
	Age (Question 2)	85
	Racial Background (Question 4)	85
	Religious Background (Questions 30-31)	86
	Education (Question 27)	86
	Occupations (Question 28).....	87
	Annual Income (Question 29)	88
	Place of Residence (Questions 25 and 71)	88
	Marital/Relationship Status (Questions 5-16)	89
	Living Situation (Questions 17-24).....	90
	Owning Pets and Other Animals (Questions 24, 71, and 74-75)	90
	On Being Vegetarian (Questions 68-69).....	91
	Social Life (Questions 21, 42, 49-54, 56, 58, 220, 280-282, 91	
	290, 302-303, and 311).....	94
	Physical Health (Question 76).....	94
	Mental Health (Questions 59-67, 77 and 343-344).....	94
CHAPTER 9	THE PARTICIPANTS' CHILDHOOD HISTORY.....	98
	Where Were the Participants Raised (Questions 26 And 70).....	98
	Who Raised the Participants? (Questions 35-41)	99
	With Whom did the Participants Spend Time? (Questions 42-49 and 56).....	99
	Knowledge of People who had Sex With Animals	
	(Questions 86, and 273-274).....	100
	Growing Up With Pets and Animals (Questions 48, 70, 72-73, and 300).....	101
CHAPTER 10	THE PARTICIPANTS' SEXUAL HISTORY	
	(Not Related to Bestiality/Zoophilia)	103
	Sexual Education (Questions 78-86 and 89-102).....	103
	First Orgasm (Question 87).....	104
	First Masturbation (Question 88)	104
	First Heterosexual Intercourse (Questions 150-151).....	105
	Number of Heterosexual Partners (Question 152)	105
	First Homosexual Contact (Questions 158-159).....	106
	Number of Homosexual Partners (Question 160)	106
	Childhood Abuse and Incest (Questions 55-58 and 103-149).....	106

CHAPTER 11	PARTICIPANTS' CURRENT SEXUAL BEHAVIORS AND ATTITUDES (Not Related to Bestiality/Zoophilia)	112
	Current Masturbation (Questions 167-170)	112
	Sexual Fantasies (Questions 171-182)	112
	Sexual Activities (Questions 183-206)	113
	Current Heterosexual Activities (Questions 153-157, 171, and 187-191)	116
	Current Homosexual Activities (Questions 10-13, 18-19, 161-166, 172-174, and 188-193).....	117
	Paraphilias (Questions 67, 176-179, 182, 195-197, and 199-203).....	118
	Sexual Attitudes and Philosophy (Questions 32-34 and 207)	119
CHAPTER 12	PARTICIPANTS' SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ANIMALS.....	121
	Why did the Participants Begin to Have Sex with Animals? (Questions 220 and 275-297).....	121
	The First Sexual Experience with an Animal (Questions 208-210 and 221-227)	125
	Number and Specie of Animal Sex Partners (Questions 211-212 and 243-260)	129
	How Often do the Participants Have Sex with Animals? (Questions 213-216)	131
	What do the Participants Sexually Do with Animals? (Questions 228-242)....	132
	Why do the Participants Currently Have Sex with Animals? (Questions 301-314)	134
	Using Pornography (Questions 204- 206, 220, 291, 294-297, and 312).....	135
	On Being Forced to Have Sex with Animals (Questions 288, 298- 299 and 309).....	137
	To which Animals are the Participants Most Attracted? (Questions 261-269)	137
	Homosexual Relations with Animals (Questions 166, 223, and 228-269)	139
	Being Caught (Questions 270-272, and 348-349).....	140
	Other People who Know (Questions 319-322, and 341-342)	142
	Allowing Other People to Have Sex with Their Animals (Questions 315-316)	146
	Initiating or Forcing Others into having Sex with Animals (Questions 317-318 and 327-328)	148
	Paid Sex with Animals (Questions 323-326)	149
	Medical Procedures relating to having Sex with Animals (Questions 331-336)	149
	What does the Animal Feel about having Sex with Humans? (Questions 227 and 347).....	150
	Forcing Animals to have Sex (Questions 329-330, and 347).....	153
	Definitions (Questions 337-340).....	155
	How would the Participants' Life be Different If they had a Close Intimate/Sexual Relationship with a Human Being? (Question 346)	160
	How has having Sex with Animals Influenced the Participants' Life-Style? (Question 345)	162
	The Wish to Stop having Sex with Animals (Questions 343-344)	165
CHAPTER 13	IS THERE A SEXUAL ORIENTATION TOWARD ANIMALS?	168
	Having had Sexual Relations With Animals — The Dependent Variable (Questions 198, 212-216, and 301-314)	168
	The Existence of Affectional Orientation Toward Animals (Questions 218, 287, 308, 315-316, and 337-338).....	168
	The Existence of Sexual Fantasy About having Sex With Animals (Questions 180-182, 220, and 293).....	169

	The Existence of Erotic Orientation Toward Animals (Questions 217, 219-220, 261-269, 289, 310, 337-338, 340, and 343-344)	170
CHAPTER 14	LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY	173
	The Study is Not Representative	173
	Validity And Reliability	173
	Questions in the Questionnaire	174
	My Bias	175
	Suggestions for Future Studies.....	178
CHAPTER 15	COMPARISONS WITH OTHER STUDIES	180
CHAPTER 16	A CLOSER LOOK AT SOME OF THE PARTICIPANTS.....	183
	“The stallions are usually happy to play at the drop of a hat”	183
	His web-site “averaged a hit every three minutes on the opening page”	185
	“I have slit open the bellies of puppies and used the hole for a place to fuck”	189
	“I lost my virginity that day	190
	“I can understand dogs better than humans”	191
	“The only unnatural sex act is one that cannot be performed!”	192
	“Sex is merely an expression of love”.....	193
	His favorite sexual fantasy involved “having sex with animals”	194
	“I was a farm kid”	195
	“Sexual relations with a 1700 lb. bull?”	195
	“I am sick. I prefer animals to humans”	199
	Exclusively animal sex.....	200
	“There is something more straightforward and earthy in animal sex”	202
	“Having a non-zoo for my wife has been difficult”	204
	“My first sexual contact was with my guide dog”	205
EPILOGUE	208
REFERENCES	212
APPENDIX I	In The Chat Room.....	219
APPENDIX II	The Questionnaire	236
APPENDIX III	What Else Did The Participants Want to Share?.....	261
APPENDIX IV	“Are You a Zoo?” Quiz — Some Coffee Time Entertainment	266
INDEX	268

PROLOGUE

This is a book about people who have sexual relations with animals, a behavior known as “bestiality,” and people (known as “zoos”) who are sexually and emotionally attracted to animals, a condition known as “zoophilia.” More specifically, this book details my journey conducting a study about bestiality and zoophilia.

It all started when my client, I’ll call him Chris, told me he could not find any literature about bestiality/zoophilia. I had been seeing him, in my psychotherapy practice, because he could not stop having sex with dogs. He was a very religious man and believed it was wrong to have sexual relations with anything other than women, and even then, only when you are married to that woman. However, he could not control his urges to have sex with the dogs in his neighborhood.

I asked the librarian at the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) to conduct a literature search for me (at that time I was not connected to the Internet), which resulted in very disappointing findings — there was nothing out there about bestiality and zoophilia other than one autobiography by Mark Matthews: *The Horseman; Obsessions of a Zoophile*. In this book, the author describes his struggles to accept the fact that he loved his horse more than he loved his wife. He portrayed himself as an intelligent, professional individual, sexually attracted to horses, and eventually, after admitting to himself his love for his horse, he married his horse.

I was intrigued with the idea that there are people who may be sexually attracted to animals, and may even prefer animals as sex partners to humans. I decided to dedicate my doctoral dissertation to this topic and began to study bestiality and zoophilia.

This was not an easy thing to do. Some of my colleagues and friends thought I was out of my mind: “You are going to study what?” Some concluded there was something wrong with me, that I needed therapy, and/or that I myself was having sex with animals. The man I was dating at that time could not even handle discussing the topic. But, there were others who encouraged me and my controversial investigation, and I was set to be one of the first researchers to study this virtually unknown phenomenon and to conduct a large scale, professional study on bestiality/zoophilia. This book describes my journey and my findings.

My findings provide abundant and rich information about the life and behaviors of its participants. Most of the data are new information that can begin to give sexologists elementary knowledge about the relatively unexplored lives and behaviors of individuals who have had sexual relations with animals.

The book is divided into two sections. The first section, Literature Review, begins with defining sexual relations with animals (chapter 1). Throughout the literature review, it is very obvious that authors perceive sexual relations with animals in very different ways. Definitions of various behaviors and attitudes are often conflicting, leaving the reader confused. Terms such as “sodomy,” “zoorasty,” “zoosexuality,” as well as “bestiality” and “zoophilia” are often used, each having a different meaning depending on the author. This first chapter describes the confusion and conflicting view points, while providing the different definitions.

Chapter 2 describes the phenomenon of sexual relations with animals and the attitudes about it throughout history and in various cultures; from prehistoric times, through ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome, through the Middle ages, the Renaissance period, the American colonies, and to Europe today. Chapter 2 also discusses bestiality in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Americas. All the information in Chapter 2 (and in this first section) was taken from the literature. Most of the material reviewed and discussed is anecdotal, some is unbelievable, and occasionally authors provide conflicting data. It is important to keep in mind that many of the facts and views presented in this chapter came from works that are highly questionable with regard to their validity.

Chapter 3, Theories and Opinions, reviews what different authors have said about the mental health status of zoophiles and bestialists, why people engage in sexual relations with animals, the frequency of bestiality, the issue of animals’ consent, animals’ cross-breeding, and bestiality and the arts. Again, views are conflicting and often confusing.

The most important part of a literature review is the review of other studies on the related topic, which is the subject of Chapter 4. The five most relevant and important studies for comparison purposes with my study are: Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin's (1948) study on the sexual behaviors of American men; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard's (1953) study on the sexual behaviors of American women; the Hunt survey (1974); Peretti and Rowan (1983); and Donofrio (1996). Most other works on bestiality involve "case studies," and are usually written in a pseudo-scientific manner. Chapter 4 provides a chronological description of research findings and related studies, including four examples of pseudo-scientific reports which are highly questionable as to their validity and reliability.

After the Introduction to the second section of the book, My Own Study on Bestiality/ Zoophilia, the fifth chapter describes how I found the subjects/participants for the study. I placed ads in different places and talked to many people. Most importantly, I posted an ad on the Internet at alt.sex.bestiality bulletin board. This enabled me to make contact with the zoo community on the Internet, resulting in an invitation to meet with them in a chat room, receiving many phone calls from potential participants, and a visit to a zoo gathering.

In Chapter 6, I describe the Focus Groups I conducted while attending the zoo gathering. These focus groups provided me with further data about the issues with which zoos are dealing. They talked about how difficult it was to be a zoo, to find other zoos, and to "come out" to their family members and friends. They complained about the fact that the media made zoos look like perverts, pedophiles, and rapists, and cried about losing their animal sex partners whose life span is much shorter than humans'. Chapter 6 provides most of the transcript of these focus groups.

Chapter 7 discusses my research project. It describes how I designed the questionnaire and the methods I employed in this study. It was very important to me that all volunteers for the study make telephone contact with me to allow me to screen them for authenticity, and to obtain the individual's postal address. Every questionnaire that was sent out had my original signature on its cover letter. The cover letter was the same page the participants had to sign as their Informed Consent. If it were to come back as a photocopy, the questionnaire would have been eliminated from the study. A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix II.

Next, I provide the results of the study. All the participants' answers are tabulated and displayed in tables in addition to my summaries and comments, and all percentages are rounded off for coherency. In Chapter 8, general information about the participants, such as their age, religious background, education level, marital/relationship status, owning pets and other animals, living situation, social life, and mental health status is discussed.

Chapter 9 addresses the participant's childhood history. Issues such as who raised them, where they were raised, with whom they spent time, what pets did they have, and when did they find out that other people had sex with animals are discussed. In Chapter 10, sexually oriented childhood history is provided. This chapter deals with where and when the participants learned about various sexual issues such as masturbation, orgasm, heterosexual and homosexual sex. A discussion about childhood abuse (mainly sexual) and incest is included as well.

In Chapter 11, the participants' current sexual behaviors and attitudes (not necessarily related to bestiality/zoophilia) are explored. This chapter gives the reader an opportunity to find out what sexual relationships the participants have had other than with their animals, what sexual activities they have engaged in, and in what frequency. The chapter further reviews the participants' sexual attitudes and philosophy.

Chapter 12 includes all the data about the participants' sexual relations with animals. It describes their first sexual experience with an animal, the number and kind of animals they had sex with, what sexual behaviors they engaged in with animals and in what frequency, what they think the animals feel about having sex with them, and how the participants define themselves. It provides answers to questions such as how would their life be different if they had a close intimate/sexual relationship with a human being, and why would they or why would they not want to stop having sex with animals. Since many of the questions were open ended, many of the participants' answers are quoted so that the reader could more objectively understand their responses.

Chapter 13 repeats and summarizes the answer to the basic research question in the current study — is there a sexual orientation toward animals? The definition of "sexual orientation" was adapted from Francoeur

(1991) in his discussion of homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality. According to this definition, sexual orientation consists of three interrelated aspects: (1) affectional orientation — who or what we bond with emotionally; (2) sexual fantasy orientation — with whom or what we fantasize having sex; and (3) erotic orientation — with whom or what we prefer to have sex.

Since the current study was a descriptive one and had some inherent flaws, Chapter 14 describes its limitations. Also included is a discussion about my bias; a bias not about bestiality, zoophilia and the individuals involved, but rather against discrimination and hatred of people who are misunderstood.

Chapter 15 compares my findings with Kinsey et al.'s (1948) study on the sexual behaviors of American men, Kinsey et al.'s (1953) study on the sexual behaviors of American women, the Gebhard et al.'s (1965) study on sex offenders, the Hunt survey (1974), Peretti and Rowan's (1983) study, and Donofrio's (1996) doctoral dissertation.

Chapter 16 goes back to describing the participants. Here, two women and 13 men (all but one man randomly chosen) are described in more detail as separate individuals. Each case study depicts a participant's own unique story, describing his/her different backgrounds, experiences, thoughts, and feelings. Obviously, the participants' names and identifying details were changed.

The Epilogue reviews what happened since I sent out the questionnaires and collected my data in 1996. After the References, four Appendixes follow. The first appendix depicts the transcript's excerpts of a conversation I had in an Internet chat room with zoophiles before I began my study. The second appendix provides a copy of the questionnaire. The third appendix includes some of the comments made by the participants in response to the last question in the questionnaire, which asked "Is there anything else you would like to share?" The fourth appendix is an amusing quiz ("Are You a Zoo") that one of the zoos sent me. I decided to include it in the book since it provides another glimpse into the zoos' way of thinking.

There is a lot of material in this book. Different readers may find different parts of the book more interesting. For some, the literature review may be of most interest, for others, the results of the study. Yet others may find the personal stories in Chapter 16 or the first appendix most engaging.

I hope this book will begin to provide you, the reader, with some basic knowledge of understanding about the understudied and misunderstood phenomena of bestiality and zoophilia, and the individuals involved. Hopefully, this work will help to demystify a topic which has long suffered ridicule and pseudo-scientific rhetoric, and will open the door to further, more needed research.

SECTION I

LITERATURE REVIEW

- CHAPTER 1 DEFINING SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ANIMALS
- CHAPTER 2 BESTIALITY AND ZOOPHILIA THROUGHOUT HISTORY
 AND IN VARIOUS CULTURES
- CHAPTER 3 THEORIES AND OPINIONS
- CHAPTER 4 STUDIES CONCERNING BESTIALITY AND ZOOPHILIA

I spent days in the library of the Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality in San Francisco, California, at the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, and at the library of the National Institute for Mental Health (NIMH) in Bethesda, Maryland. I found a specialized magazine, *The Wild Animal Revue*, which provided me with much information about sexual relations with animals, and its editor was so kind as to lend me several rare books to help with my study. I bought other rare books in a little store in New York, and the Internet was a source of abundant information about bestiality and zoophilia as well.

I ended up finding many books and articles whose authors mention and sometimes even discuss bestiality and zoophilia. Many authors suggest that human beings have had sexual relations with animals since the dawn of history and throughout the world (in some countries more than in others.) These authors assert that sexual relations with animals has been practiced, thought about, dreamed of, and has emerged in myth, fairytale, folklore, literature, painting, and sculpture (Cauldwell, 1948; Dumont, 1970; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948; Kullinger, 1969; Masters, 1962). None of them, however, provides an in-depth picture into the lives and behaviors of the people who engage in sexual relations with animals. Many authors volunteer their opinions and discuss humans' sexual relations with animals as though they are an authority on the subject. Their opinions, however, are often conflicting and cause much confusion to the reader.

CHAPTER 1

DEFINING SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ANIMALS

Differing and conflicting view points can be seen in the variety of terms associated with bestiality and zoophilia in the literature, and their definitions. According to the *Webster's New World Dictionary* (Neufeldt & Guralnik, 1989), "sodomy" is "any sexual intercourse held to be abnormal, especially bestiality or anal intercourse between two male persons." According to Karpman (1962), "sodomy" originally meant only male homosexuality or pederasty. Later it came to include all "unnatural acts," especially "zoophilia." Karpman (1962) further relates that the criminal code defines "sodomy" as carnal knowledge of animal or bird, of male or female by anus or mouth, or intercourse with a dead body.

"Sodomy" has come to refer to any number of "unnatural" sexual acts (Niemoeller, 1946; Stayton, 1994). From the first century C.E. to the present time, the term "sodomy" has been linked at various times to "crimes against nature" like masturbation, oral-genital contact, oral-anal contact, anal intercourse, bestiality, and any other type of sexual activity that did not lead to procreation (Stayton, 1994). "Buggery" is another term often used as "sodomy" (anal intercourse) or as "bestiality" (Karpman, 1962).

Rosenfeld (1967) and Rosenberger (1968) relate that the term "zoerasty" should be used when intercourse with animals is an established preference, and the person who prefers such contacts should be called a "zoerast." Krafft-Ebing (1935) suggests the term "zoerasty" for those of a pathological nature, and Cornog and Perper (1994) define "zoerasty" as direct sexual contact with animals as in "bestiality," but with a decidedly pathological component.

Yet, according to Masters (1966), a "zoerast" is anyone who has sexual relations with an animal (Masters, 1966). Moreover, "zoerasty" has sometimes been employed to describe sexual use of animals where no emotional involvement exists. "Zooerasty," in this regard, is a form of masturbation, seen as a substitute for sexual relations with a human being. By far, the author relates, the majority of those who engage in "bestiality" are "zoerasts" (Masters, 1962).

The term "zoophilia" is often used either as a synonym for bestiality, or as a term for predominant or exclusive desire for sexual relations with animals (Masters, 1966). Most authors seem to agree with the *Webster's New World Dictionary's* (Neufeldt & Guralnik, 1989) definition of "bestiality" — "any sexual relations between a person and an animal" (Braun, 1967; Caprio, 1951, in Trimble, 1969; Cornog & Perper, 1994; Ford & Beach, 1951; Fox, 1994; Gregersen, 1983; Karpman, 1962; Masters et al., 1995; Masters et al., 1988; Niemoeller, 1946; Sword, 1978). The dictionary's definition for "zoophilia" (also known as "zoophilism") — "extreme love for animals, specifically abnormal sexual attraction to animals," although generally agreed upon, often receives additional qualifications by various authors.

Matthews, the author of *The Horseman* (1994), explains that there are two general classes of people who have sex with animals. There are the "bestialists" who have one or a few sexual contacts with an animal, or they use animals when a more "normal" outlet is not available. The second class of people are the "zoophiles." These are the people who prefer an animal as a sex partner, often forming deep emotional relationships with it (Matthews, 1994).

On the Internet, on Stasya's ZooPage or Home Page (1996), which was the "official" alt.sex.bestiality Frequently Asked Questions web site (more on the Internet later), one can find working definitions for the various terms. According to Stasya (1996), a "zoophile" loves and cares for his/her partner. A bestialist uses the animal for self gratification with no concern for the animal, like "someone who is horny, fucks the animal for release and walks away."

Krafft-Ebing (1935) suggests using the term "bestiality" for those cases which are not of a pathological character, and Storr (1964) relates that "bestiality" consists of using animals as sex objects (Storr, 1964). A.F.N., the translator of Dubois-Desaulle's work (1933), points out that from an etymological point of view, "bestiality" refers merely to the nature of a beast, and is not restricted to sexual practices. On the other hand,

Rosenfeld (1967) and Blake (1971) use the term “bestiality” to indicate actual sexual intercourse with animals, and the term “bestialist” to indicate one who has intercourse with animals.

Fox (1994) defines “zoophilia” as an emotional attachment to an animal, that causes a human being to prefer a non-human animal as a companion and/or as a sexual partner. A person can be a “zoophile” and never actually have a sexual relationship with an animal. A person can also be a “bestialist” and enjoy the pleasure animals can give, but not necessarily have a deep emotional relationship with them. Fox (1994) also emphasizes that one is not better than the other. Braun (1967) and Masters (1962) add that in “zoophilia” there is a genuine feeling for the animal on the part of the human. Sometimes the term “zoophilia” is extended to embrace emotional attachments to animals where no sexual relations occur and sexual desires are not consciously present (Braun, 1967; Masters, 1962). “Zoophilia” can also refer to any sort of excessive emotional involvement with an animal (Masters, 1966).

According to Tanka (1995), a “zoophile” is someone who not only loves animals, but also makes love to them, if the animals “consent.” Gregersen (1984) relates that “zoophilia” refers to sexual attraction to animals, and Karpman (1962) defines “zoophilia” as sexual excitement experienced with stroking or fondling of animals. Others suggest that when the act or sexual fantasy about sexual contact with animals is a repeatedly preferred or exclusive means of obtaining sexual excitement, it is defined as “zoophilia” (Masters *et al.*, 1995; Masters *et al.*, 1988). Money (1981) suggests that “zoophilia” is “the condition of being dependent on sexual activity with an animal in order to initiate and maintain erotosexual arousal and facilitate orgasm,” and Cornog and Perper (1994) define “zoophilia” as stroking or petting an animal as an erotic stimulus.

Rosenfeld (1967) and Rosenberger (1968) suggest that “zoophilia” is an animal fetishism, where the perversion is relatively mild and is defined as a perversity. The “zoophilist” (zoophile) may be sensually satisfied by stroking or petting an animal, or may engage in acts with animals such as masturbation or oral sex.

Kurrelgyre (1995) asserts that although some people have relationships with animals because they cannot find a human partner, these individuals are not true “zoophiles.” He further points out that all “zoophiles” are not attracted to all animals (Kurrelgyre, 1995).

According to Sword (1978), “bestiality” can take any one of three possible forms: (1) sexual arousal by observing sexual activities of animals, (2) sexual arousal by using animals or something about the animals, such as fur, as sexual objects, and (3) actual sexual activity with an animal (Sword, 1978). It is interesting to note that Marshall (1972) has a similar view, but his is about “zoophilia.” According to Marshall (1972), “zoophilia,” as “a sexual deviation,” may take several forms: (1) deriving sexual pleasure from fondling animals, (2) deriving sexual pleasure from observing the sexual activities of animals, (3) a form of fetish built around animal skins and/or furs, and (4) deriving sexual pleasure from actual intercourse with an animal (Marshall, 1972).

Of all these different definitions, I feel most comfortable with Kurrelgyre’s (1995) explanation. According to Kurrelgyre (1995), “zoophilia” is an emotional attachment to an animal that causes a human being to prefer a non-human animal as a companion and/or sexual partner. “Bestiality” is generally defined as any sexual contact between a human being and a non-human animal. These definitions depict a spectrum. Generally, both the sexual and emotional aspects play vital roles within the relationships of “zoophilia” and “bestiality” (Kurrelgyre, 1995).

In this book, I use the term “bestiality” as “any sexual contact between a human being and a non-human animal,” and the term “zoophilia” as “an emotional attachment and/or sexual attraction to an animal.” A “bestialist” is a person who engages in sexual relations with animals, and a “zoophile” is “a person who has an emotional attachment and/or sexual attraction to an animal.” Although the term “bestiality” may be considered by some as carrying a negative connotation, this is definitely not my intention. In this book, I use the term “bestiality” as a general term for those who practice sexual relations with animals, which includes both bestialists and zoophiles. Many zoophiles in the Internet community, refer to themselves as “zoos,” or “zoo” in singular. I, therefore, use the terms “zoos” and “zoo” when discussing zoophiles. I further define “Sexual relations” (for the purpose of my study and in this book) as any physical contact between a person and an animal, that results in sexual pleasure for the human participant.

There is another new term, coined by the zoo community on the Internet: “zoosexuality,” implying a sexual orientation toward animals. Stasya (1996) and Tanka (1995) explain that a “zoosexual” is a “zoophile” who is sexually attracted to and has a sexual relationship with his/her partner/animal. Shepherd (1996) adds, that a “zoosexual” is someone who feels that his/her animal is “more like a spouse and definitely not as a sex toy. It is a deep emotional and physical attachment not unlike two married humans.” According to Tanka (1995), however, within “zoosexuals” there are debates over what to call themselves, and the term “zoosexuality” is still under criticism.

There are other terms which are sometimes used in the literature. They are presented here to provide a more complete overview of the various terms that exist about this topic: “Mixoscopic zoophilia” was termed by Ellis (in Rosenberger, 1968) to mean deriving sexual pleasure by watching animals copulate. This term is also used by Cornog and Perper (1994) with the same definition.

Masters (1962) defines “psychical bestiality” as deriving sexual stimulation as a result of the following behaviors: watching animals copulate with one another, otherwise known as “mixoscopic zoophilia,” watching exhibitions of bestiality, fantasizing about bestiality, and using various pornographic materials depicting bestiality.

According to Love (1992), the term “bestial erotica” is used when people become sexually aroused by the sight of mating animals. People may at first actually be repulsed by the sight, but later will become aroused. Sometimes children or older people become fascinated at the sight of a male animal ejaculating, and will sometimes take an active role by masturbating the animal. These people do not necessarily want to have intercourse with animals. Love (1992) adds that “bestial erotica” and fantasies that involve sex with animals are common and have no apparent harmful effects.

“Stuff-fetishism” or “zoophilia erotica” is regarded by Krafft-Ebing (in Trimble, 1969) as a sensual attraction, something bordering on but not quite a sexual attraction for a pet. In this case, the individual will derive pleasurable sensation from playing, embracing, and kissing the animal. Society, Trimble (1969) notes, tends to look on these behaviors as a normal affectionate relationship between a human being and an animal, unless it develops into something more overtly and obviously sexual.

The term “formicophilia” means “love of ants” (Dekkers, 1994), and refers to a condition in which sexual arousal and orgasm are dependent on the sensations produced by the crawling or nibbling of creatures like snails, frogs, flies, and ants on the human’s sexual organs (Dewaraja & Money, 1986; Love, 1992; Money, 1986).

Allen (1979) discusses the term “bestiosexuality” and defines it as the use of an animal as a sexual object. “Ophiolagnia” is sexual obsession with snakes, which according to Christy (1967) is probably more prevalent in society than is generally believed. According to Love (1992), “ophidicium” refers to the use of snakes for sexual pleasure. The sexual preference for a dog is called “cynophilia.” “Androzoons” are male animals that are trained to have sexual relations with women, and “gynezoons” are animals trained to have sexual relations with men. The practice of an animal performing oral sex on a human being is called “zoolinction.” There is a belief about “felching” being the act of inserting a live animal into the anus or vagina for the purpose of receiving sexual pleasure from its body movements. According to this belief, “felching” is often done with gerbils, rodents, or fish. “Bestialism” includes people who derive sexual pleasure from torturing or mutilating animals. “Necrobialism” refers to the sexual act with dead animals, and “pseudozoophilia” refers to sexual fantasy games where a human partner plays the role of an animal. Sex slaves, in the S/M life style, sometimes take on the role of a pet dog, and are made to wear a leash, eat and drink out of dog dishes, etc. (Love, 1992).

CHAPTER 2

BESTIALITY AND ZOOPHILIA THROUGHOUT HISTORY AND IN VARIOUS CULTURES

The literature review I conducted reveals that human sexual relations with animals existed forever and in almost every place and culture in the world. The following is a literature review of bestiality and the attitudes about it throughout history and in various cultures. (Some of the sub-sections are short while others are much longer, depending on the amount of information available on the particular period in history and/or culture).

All the opinions presented here are taken from the literature. Most of the material reviewed and discussed is anecdotal, some is unbelievable, and occasionally authors provide conflicting data. It is important to take into consideration that many of the facts and views presented here came from works that are highly questionable with regard to their validity. Other than the biblical text, which I could read in the original Hebrew and understand its context, I was unable to confirm the data reviewed and presented here.

Prehistoric Times

Many discoveries of paintings and carvings showing humans and animals having sexual relations have been found in various ancient religious temples (Davis, 1954), indicating the pre-occupation of ancient man with bestiality (Stekel, 1952). According to Rosenberger (1968), the practice of human-animal sex began at least in the Fourth Glacial Age, between 40,000 and 25,000 years ago, while Garrison (1959) relates that the process of domestication of animals was virtually completed by man before the beginning of recorded history.

According to Taylor (1996), an engraved bone rod from the cave of La Madeleine, France, from the later Ice Ages (around 25,000 years ago), depicts a lioness licking the opening of either a gigantic human penis or a vulva. An Iron Age cave painting from the seventh century B.C., from Val Camonica, Italy, portrays a man inserting his penis into the vagina or anus of a donkey (Gregersen, 1983; Taylor, 1996), and ancient rock art discovered in Siberia depicts men copulating with moose (Taylor, 1996). In 1889, further drawings were discovered on cave walls in France. In one cave, in Font-de-Gaume Breuil, colored stone engravings of men mounting animals that resembled cows, were uncovered (Rosenberger, 1968). A rock drawing from Ti-m-Lalan, Fezzan (5000 B.C.), shows an animal resembling a fox/dog copulating with a woman (Neret, 1994). Depictions of bestiality were also found in rock paintings in Bohuslan, southwestern Sweden, from the Bronze Age (the 2nd millennium B.C.), in which a man is inserting his penis under the tail of a large quadruped (Dekkers, 1994; Liliequist, 1988).

According to Waine (1968), cave drawings of the Stone Age leave no doubt that our prehistoric ancestors enjoyed frequent and pleasurable sexual relations with their half-wild dogs. Moreover, the fact that these drawings have an integral part in a clan's family history, indicates that it was a common act (Ellison, 1970; Waine, 1968). Even if these ancient men did not have sexual intercourse with animals, they evidently desired it and depicted their desire in cave drawings (Rosenberger, 1968). Taylor (1996) theorizes that bestiality scenes in rock art seem to stress the power of the human male's penis; nevertheless, bestiality may well have been a part of Neolithic life.

Ancient Near East

Archeological findings demonstrate that bestiality was practiced in Babylonia, the ancient empire in Mesopotamia, which prospered in the third millennium B.C.. Hammurabi, the sixth and greatest king of the First Dynasty, ruled the Babylonian empire for 43 years (1955-1913 B.C.), revised previous Sumerian and Akkadian laws, and produced the Code of Hammurabi, written in cuneiform on clay tablets, which contained

nearly 300 legal provisions. One of these laws proclaimed death for any person engaging in bestiality (Blake, 1972; Ellison, 1970; Hamilton, 1981). Male bestialists had to be chained to the animal involved and then both were burned to death (Rosenfeld, 1967; Trimble, 1969).

Nevertheless, according to Waite (1968), during the spring fertility rites of Babylon, dogs were used for maintaining a constant orgy condition for seven days and nights. The dogs were held down and fellated until erect. They then were used by both men and women until they got tired of it or the abused animal died. The dead dog's penis was cut off, and when dry and hardened, was used for further sexual escapades of the fertility festival. Other animals were similarly used (Waite, 1968).

In the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic, the wildman-hero, Enkidu, has sexual relations with animals, until he encounters a sacred prostitute, a representative of the cult of Ishtar, who seduces him and cures him of his zoophilic inclinations (Masters, 1962).

For the Hittites, (around 13th century B.C.), the predecessors of the Hebrews in the Holy Land, lying with a cow or dog was forbidden and punishable by death. However, if a man lay with a horse or a mule, there was no punishment, although this must not happen in the proximity of the king or such a man might not become a priest: "If a man lies with a hog or dog, he shall die... If a bull rear upon a man, the bull shall die, but the man shall not die... If a boar rear upon a man, there is no penalty... If a man lies with a horse or mule, there is no penalty, but he shall not come near the king, and he shall not become a priest" (Gregersen, 1983; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948, pp. 668-669).

Dekkers (1994) suggests that the Hittites were more concerned with a distinction between pure and impure animals than with regulating sexual activity. Kinsey *et al.* (1948), propose that these certain restrictions had to do with superstition, and are paralleled by the taboos which made certain foods suitable to eat and others not.

The Book of Leviticus states that bestiality was very wide-spread in the country of Canaan (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Niemoeller, 1946b). In the 15th century B.C., Ugaritic mythology asserted that Canaan's god Baal once copulated with a heifer, and as a result of this divinely bestial act a child named Mes or Mos was born (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962). Also, Middle Eastern mythology tells us that by constant copulation with heifers, the Phoenician phallic god Baal made his penis enormous (Edwardes & Masters, 1977).

The Hebrews took issue with all the previous inhabitants of the Holy Land and their customs; thus the Old Testament prohibits sexual activity with all animals. Even mixing of animals and human beings or gods was banned; depicting God with an animal's head or an animal's body, as the Egyptians and Greeks did, was an abomination (Dekkers, 1994).

Bestiality was very closely linked with male homosexuality in the ancient Hebrew mind (Rosenfeld, 1967). The Hebrews always considered sexual relations with animals a form of worshiping other gods, as was homosexuality, and the bestialist and the animal were both to be put to death. The purpose of these taboos was to set apart the Jewish people, "the chosen people," from their neighbors. The taboos helped to maintain and reinforce the boundaries of the group, and enabled it to retain its distinctive identity under adverse circumstances (Davies, 1982). Masters (1962) states that these prohibitions were the result of an urgent need to increase the population among the ancient Hebrews, and that no sexual act was tolerated which was not aimed at procreation.

In Deuteronomy 23:18 it is said: "Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog, into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow: for even both these are abomination unto the Lord thy God." According to Dubois-Desaulle's translator, A. F. N. (1933), this seems to point to an organized, commercialized, and religious form of bestiality in which the fees derived from the rental of specially trained dogs were delivered to the temple.

The following are the biblical references concerning sexual relations with animals: "Whoever lies with a beast, shall be put to death" (Exodus 22:19), "You shall not lie with a man as with a woman: that is an abomination. You shall not have sexual intercourse with any beast to make yourself unclean with it, nor shall a woman submit herself to intercourse with a beast: that is a violation of nature. You shall not make yourselves unclean in any of these ways..." (Leviticus 18: 22-24), "A man who has sexual intercourse with any beast shall be put to death and you shall kill the beast. If a woman approaches any animal to have intercourse with it you

shall kill the woman and the beast” (Leviticus 20: 15-16), and “Cursed be he who lies with any kind of beast” (Deuteronomy 27:21).

As can be seen, there are two references concerning women who have sexual contacts with animals in the Old Testament (Leviticus 18:23 and Leviticus 20:16), and four references concerning men. All bestiality prohibitions in the Old Testament are part of a list of behaviors that God forbade the Hebrews from doing, since these were activities neighboring peoples practiced as rituals of worship of their gods. The punishment for a woman who had sexual relations with an animal was death, as it was for the animal.

The Talmud, a commentary on the Old Testament, says that “a Jew is not to be suspected of pederasty or bestiality” (Qiddushin 82a, in Gregersen, 1983), and that a widow is forbidden to keep a pet dog, lest she be tempted to have sexual relations with it (Bullough, 1976; Dekkers, 1994; Gregersen, 1983; Hunt, 1974). The Talmud makes more frequent references to women who have sexual relations with animals, while repeating the Biblical rules: Kethuboth 65a, Yebamoth 59b, Sanhedrin 2a, 15a, 53a, 55a, and Abodah Zarah 22b-23a (Kinsey et al., 1953).

Ancient Egypt

According to Masters (1962), in ancient Egypt, the representation of the Egyptian gods as being part human and part animal, was linked to the belief that living animals took part in the divinity of the gods. In their mythology, the goddess Mut, in the form of a cow, was loved by the god Amon (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962), and Bast, the cat goddess, had human lovers (Masters, 1962). Other gods had animal forms as well: Thoth, the god of all wisdom, had the head of an ibis, and Horus had the head of a hawk. Anubis, the god who guided the dead, had the head of a jackal (Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967) although, according to Waite (1968), Anubis had the upper body of a man and the lower body of a dog. Knummu, the master god and creator of the universe, had the body of a man and the head of a ram. Isis, the goddess of motherhood and fertility, had the head of a cow, and Set had human legs, while the rest of his body and head looked like a greyhound (Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). The ancient Egyptians worshiped gods with animal shapes almost exclusively in the pre-dynastic period before about 3000 B.C.. Even as late as classical times, the Egyptian gods retained their animal characteristics as reminders of their ancestry (Douglas, 1992).

Blake (1972) suggests that the word “bestiality” may have come from “Bes” who was an erotically prominent creature in the mythology of Egyptian origin between the 15th and 20th centuries B.C.. According to Blake (1972), Bes, “in the form of a robust dwarf of bestial aspect, was a marriage-god, and overlooked the toilet of women.”

Cheops (3733 B.C.), known for building one of the pyramids, was also known for his passion for sexual intercourse with mares and other animals (Rosenfeld, 1967). Thothmes II who ruled from Ethiopia to the Euphrates in the 18th Dynasty (1500 B.C.) was a king of unusual distinction in Egyptian history. He was also known for his fondness for having sexual intercourse with swine, which he kept in his palace, and with female children. Queen Hatasu was known to prefer the company of women to men, and had her trained dogs perform cunnilingus on her (Rosenberger, 1968). Cleopatra is said to have had a box that was filled with bees which she had placed against her genitals for stimulation, similar to a vibrator (Love, 1992). Under Psammetichus I, of the 26th Dynasty in Egypt (664-600 B.C.), it was part of religious ritual for the high priests to copulate with a cow (Rosenberger, 1968).

Writing about the history of Egypt from 3000 B.C. through 1100 A.D., Tannahill (1992) points out that sexual intercourse with cattle or any other large domesticated animal was not uncommon. Egyptian men often used the ass, since this type of animal was the most common in their region. Sheep, pigs, and mares were also used, while the women resorted to dogs (Rosenfeld, 1967; Rosenberger, 1968). According to Waite (1968), ancient Egyptians worshiped and had sexual relations with dogs. Animal-human sexual contacts are occasionally portrayed on the tombs (Bullough, 1976), and bestiality was recorded in Egyptian hieroglyphics as far back as 3000 B.C. (Ramsis, 1969).

The Egyptians were also known to copulate with the Hamadryas baboon (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962). Dog-faced baboons had sexual intercourse with Egyptian women (Bagley, 1968), and in the Nile valley, sexual contacts with apes were reported for both men and women (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962; Ramsis, 1969).

The Egyptians mastered the art of sexual congress with the crocodile. This was accomplished by turning the creature onto its back, rendering it incapable of resisting penetration. This form of copulation was believed to bring prosperity and restore the potency of men (Bledsoe, 1965; Kullinger, 1969; Love, 1992; Masters, 1962; Maybury, 1968; Ramsis, 1969). During the second century A.D., Egyptian women submitted themselves sexually to crocodiles and snakes (Blake, 1972; Davis, 1954; Trimble, 1969).

Women were also known to copulate with male goats, while men copulated with female goats. The most famous example of this was the Goat of Mendes, who was thought to be the incarnation of the procreative deity. In the temple at Mendes, many men and women engaged in worshipful bestiality with goats that were especially trained for this purpose (Bagley, 1968; Bloch, 1933; Davis, 1954; Love, 1992; Masters, 1962; Mantegazza, 1932; Maybury, 1968; Niemoeller, 1946b; Rosenfeld, 1967). Often, the goats' semen, which was highly coveted by the worshipers, was collected through oral sex — a simple way of collecting it without waste (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992).

Bestiality was further known as a cure for nymphomaniacs who were locked up in the temple at Mendes with trained goats and forced to remain there until the goats became too satiated to copulate with them. At this point, presumably, the nymphomaniacs were pronounced cured (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962). The second century A.D. Greek philosopher, Plutarch, reported that many women in Egypt were locked in pens with male goats, and later refused the advances of humans, preferring the goats as sex partners (Blake, 1972).

Another interesting story is about the Apis bull, which was thought to have had special physical characteristics, and was believed to be an incarnation of Osiris, the male principal in nature. When the bull was mature enough, he was taken to Memphis, Egypt, and housed in a special temple. For the first 40 days the Apis bull was attended only by female attendants who would sexually excite him. A priestess of the Apis bull performed “acts of phallic worship” on the bull, as well as submitting herself to sexual intercourse with him. The Egyptians believed that the bull's semen had special properties, and the female attendants were responsible for the collection of it through oral, manual, and vaginal means. When the bull died, its genitals were preserved and gilded. Special honor was given to a queen who, on her death, was buried with the gilded penis in her vagina (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992).

Nevertheless, according to Rosenberger (1968), Rosenfeld (1967), and Trimble (1969), bestiality was punishable in Egypt. At one time, a male bestialist's punishment was to be buried alive with the animal with which he had sexual relations. During another period, a bestialist was castrated and left to die in the desert. His animal was then considered a victim and nothing was done to it (Rosenberger, 1968). A free man was usually buried alive, while a slave was castrated, blinded, and left in the desert. Although female bestiality was very common in ancient Egypt, women, whether free or slaves, were often executed with a sharpened stake run into their bowels through their vaginas (Rosenfeld, 1967; Trimble, 1969). During another period in Egyptian history, women who had sex with animals were beheaded or raped to death by a goat (Rosenberger, 1968). During the period known as the “Old Kingdom,” both male and female bestialists were buried alive in holes filled with human excrement. During the Feudal Period, from the fourth to the 15th Dynasty, bestialists were executed by being burnt, torn limb from limb, skinned, and buried alive. The Egyptians never punished the animal involved (Rosenfeld, 1967).

Ancient Greece

Bestiality themes were very popular in Greek mythology (Bagley, 1968; Haerberle, 1978; Harris, 1969; Kinsey *et al.*, 1953; Masters, 1966; Masters, 1962; Rosenfeld, 1967; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991). As a bull, Zeus raped Demeter, who bore Persephone. He then had sexual relations with Persephone in the form of a serpent. As a bull, he also had sex with Europa, and while in swan form, Zeus copulated with Leda. This latter event was commemorated by many artists, including Da Vinci and Michelangelo (Masters, 1962; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991). As a result of this union, Leda laid eggs, in one of which was Helen who was to be the cause of the Trojan war (Dekkers, 1994; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991). As a pigeon, Zeus also seduced Phthia, and as a stallion, he had sex with Dia, Ixion's wife (Masters, 1962).

Theophane was transformed into an ewe by Poseidon, who had intercourse with her in the form of a ram. Hermes became a goat in order to have sex with Penelope. This union resulted in Pan, who as a white ram

seduced Selene, the moon goddess. Silvanus, the god of agriculture, is believed to have been conceived when his father, a shepherd, had intercourse with a goat (Bagley, 1968). Apollo made love to Atys while in serpent form. Aristo Ephesius mated with a female ass. Semiramis, the legendary foundress of Babylon, copulated with a stallion. Fulvius mated with a mare, and Pasiphae copulated with a bull — a union which resulted in the Minotaur (Masters, 1962).

According to Dekkers (1994) and *The Wild Animal Revue* (1991), the Minotaur was supposedly the son of Minos, King of Crete, and at the same time, the product of the union of his wife Pasiphae with a bull. In order to strengthen his claims to the throne of Crete, Minos wanted to show the people that the gods would grant all his prayers. He asked the sea god, Poseidon, that a bull should come out of the sea for the purpose of sacrifice, and a white bull swam immediately ashore. Minos liked it, kept it for himself, and sacrificed another bull. Poseidon was insulted and in revenge ensured that Pasiphae, Minos' wife, fall in love with the white bull. She enlisted the help of Daedalus, a craftsman, who made a life-sized, hollow cow of wood. The queen crawled into the cow and waited for the bull, which mounted the wooden cow, and in fact, copulated with Pasiphae. Minotaur was born shortly afterwards, having the body of a man and the head of a bull. The story of the Minotaur is based on the worship of bulls as fertility symbols, which was widespread in Crete and elsewhere long before the Greek period (Dekkers, 1994; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991).

In classical times, the tone of the writers of the day leaves no room to doubt that bestiality was a fairly common occurrence in daily life (Niemoeller, 1946b). One of the most popular novels of the Greek period, and also the earliest Latin novel that remained in its entirety, is the second century A.D. work called *The Golden Ass* by Lucius Apuleius. This work has long been censored because of its pornographic language and bestiality content. The hero has been changed by magic into an ass, and the novel relates, in an amusing manner, what happens to the various owners of the ass, from the point of view of the animal (Ramsis, 1969).

Bestial affairs were also acted out on the Greek stage (Masters, 1966), and the ancient Greeks, during the period of their greatest civilization, gave complete religious sanction to sexual relations with animals (Davis, 1954). During the Bacchanalia, religious fetes given in honor of the god Bacchus, acts of bestiality were committed by individuals drunk with wine and lust. These fetes took place during the night (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933). The Temple of Aphrodite Parne, the Greek Goddess of Indecent Copulation, housed beautiful women and sacred dogs. Waine (1968) suggests there was little doubt as to the forms of worship indulged in by these women. The City of Corinth once had a Temple with 10,000 prostitutes of both genders and several hundred dogs! (Waine, 1968). It is interesting to note that Bagley (1968) relates that the Greeks viewed sexual intercourse with dogs as a disgrace. Bagley (1968) and Masters (1962) also report that the entire population of the Sybarites (an ancient Greek city in south Italy, which was destroyed in 510 B.C.) were known to have had intercourse with dogs.

The Greeks were notorious for bestiality as well as homosexuality (Rosenfeld, 1967). They never punished anyone for having sexual relations with an animal. If someone wanted to have sex with an animal, it was his/her business (Rosenberger, 1968). The Greeks also believed in the power of bestiality to cure nymphomaniacs, as did ancient Egyptians. Nymphomaniacs were locked in the temples of Astarte (Anaitis), and received similar treatment to that given in the temple at Mendes (Masters, 1962). Also, during the "Retreat of the Ten Thousand," many sexual relations of men with goats were reported (Bagley, 1968).

Ancient Rome

In Roman mythology, there were many accounts of lovers appearing as asses and serpents, and of females having sexual encounters with gorillas, bulls, bears, horses, ponies, wolves, crocodiles, and goats (Harris, 1969; Kinsey et al, 1953). The Romans liked to view on stage scenes from the sexual lives of the mythological gods, including bestial acts. A popular show was the Greek story of Pasiphae and the bull (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992).

According to Dekkers (1994), the Romans did not have a law against bestiality, although Davis (1954) relates that in ancient Rome, bestiality was covered by a tax of 90 tornesi, 12 ducats and six carlini. According to Rosenberger (1968), during the time of Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.), bestialists were indeed punished by crucifixion. Later punishment was modified to castration and women were put in a sack and thrown into the

Tiber river. According to Niemoeller (1946), at the beginning of the Roman Empire, legal retribution was required only for sodomy, under which bestiality was included. The fine was 10,000 sesterces. Later, bestiality was distinguished from sodomy and made punishable by death (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Niemoeller, 1946). In any event, as the Empire expanded and grew more powerful and corrupt, punishments for bestiality became almost nonexistent (Rosenberger, 1968).

In ancient Rome, animal intercourse was the practice of shepherds and shepherdesses (Masters, 1962). According to Bagley (1968) and Masters (1962), the Romans had no reservations about sexual intercourse with dogs (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962). One of the more infamous orgies of Rome was that of the goddess Bona Dea which featured bestiality with dogs (Waine, 1968). Women copulated with bears, snakes, and crocodiles (Dekkers, 1994). Intercourse with an ass was a sport enjoyed by many noblewomen (Maybury, 1968). Roman women kept snakes which they trained to coil around their thighs and slide past the lips of their vaginas (Christy, 1967; Davis, 1954; Dekkers, 1994; Masters, 1962; Maybury, 1968). Women were also said to have serpents suck on their nipples for the benefit of paid observers (Harris, 1969). The women of Rome were chastised by Juvenal in his satires for having sexual relations with donkeys, while in fact, an old Roman law of Latium punished an adulterous woman by forcing her to have intercourse with a donkey (Bagley, 1968).

It was the Romans who invented the rape of women (and sometimes men) by animals for the amusement of the audience at the Coliseum and Circus Maximus, and bestiality flourished as a public spectacle in ancient Rome. As part of the Roman games mastiffs fought wild beasts in the arenas, and were rewarded with the rape of women slaves. A favorite crowd pleaser of the Roman games was chaining slave girls or Roman citizens who displeased those in power, and turning stimulated dogs loose upon them. Rare was the woman who survived the pack rape and gained her freedom (Blake, 1972; Masters, 1962; Waine, 1968). Sometimes, to save themselves from torture, women were obliged to commit fellatio on the various animals (Somers, 1966). Dogs were used as a warm up, since it was unlikely that a woman would die from having intercourse with a dog. The “performance” would usually end with the woman being raped by a horse. The favorite animals for that job were the ass, the horse, and the baboon (Bledsoe, 1965; Dekkers, 1994; Harris, 1969; Love, 1992; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967; Somers, 1966; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992; Trimble, 1969). These exhibitions were well established in Julius Caesar’s time (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992).

The emperor Tiberius (14-37 A.D.), among other “perversions,” had often amused himself by watching dogs lick little girls or have intercourse with adult whores. Julia, Tiberius’ wife and Augustus’ daughter, was known as a nymphomaniac. Whenever she was unable to satisfy herself by men and women, she used large dogs, which would mount her from the rear, for her sexual outlets (Rosenberger, 1968).

The emperor Claudius (37-41 A.D.) often had women executed by having a trained stallion or dog rape them while they had been spread out and fastened on a special wooden contraption (Rosenfeld, 1967). As part of his orgy feasts, emperor Nero (54-68 A.D.) forced his senator’s wives to have public intercourse with trained dogs, and the senators with sows. Nero’s pet dogs were allowed to run free among the ladies, who were cautioned not to offend the Emperor’s pets (Rosenfeld, 1967; Waine, 1968). Those senators who dared to protest were punished by having to perform cunnilingus on one of Nero’s dogs or sows (Hamilton, 1981). Once he imported one hundred newborn camels and demanded his men guests to have anal intercourse with the animals (Rosenfeld, 1967; Waine, 1968). Both Claudius and Nero were said to be addicted to bestiality, and to have participated in orgies of this type (Blake, 1972; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992).

The emperor Gaius Flavius Valerius Constantinus (274-337), known also as Constantine the Great, was the one to adopt Christianity as the official Roman religion. It is interesting to note that according to Rosenberger (1968), this same emperor also had a nickname which was “cow-fucker.”

Theodora, emperor Justinian’s wife, (520s A.D.), who later became an empress, had been, before her marriage, an actress in sex circuses, performing sexual acts with men, women, boys, girls, and animals (Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992). Theodora would place grains in her vulva, then spread her legs to allow a goose to pick the grains with its beak (Bledsoe, 1964; Love, 1992). According to Rosenfeld (1967), Theodora is considered a “saint” in the Roman Catholic Church.

According to Rosenberger (1968), empress Irene (797-802 A.D.) was known as a good Roman Catholic, but her morals did not prevent her from murdering thousands of people, including her son, and enjoying cunnilingus by young men and trained dogs. She was finally taken off the throne and exiled by

Nicephorus I in 802 A.D. (Rosenberger, 1968). According to Rosenberger (1968), Irene, too, is still considered a “saint” in the Roman Catholic Church.

The Middle Ages in Europe

Bestiality was most widespread and accepted in Western society during the Middle Ages — from the fall of the Roman Empire in 476 A.D. to the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492 (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). Animals were very common, everywhere, and they often shared the same roof with their owners. It was much more simple to have sex with a cow that was standing a foot away, than to try to have intercourse with a tired and uninterested wife, or with someone else’s wife. Also, sexual intercourse with animals was thought to be healthy and a cure for many diseases (Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). Ramsis (1969) claims that during the Middle Ages, bestiality was practiced by farmers, priests and nuns; many people were doing it, but nobody was talking about it.

During the Middle Ages, all seemingly unnatural or perverted occurrences were attributed, largely through the instigation of the Church, to the powers of Darkness and Evil, to Satan and demons. Bestiality, of course, was almost invariably connected, during this period, with black magic and witchcraft (Greenland, 1983; Niemoeller, 1946b). In the Middle Ages, bestiality received full attention from Catholic jurist-theologians, whose discussions of the matter filled volumes. One of the greatest problems involved the distinction between sexual intercourse with animals and sexual intercourse with demons which often assumed animal form for the purpose of consorting with witches (Masters, 1962). Superficially, the evidence would seem to point that there was a great deal of witchcraft, but the more subtle implication is that actually there was a great deal of bestiality going on (Niemoeller, 1946b).

According to Salisbury (1994), who provides an invaluable analysis of the relationship between the Church and bestiality, early Christian thinkers inherited two main traditions that had something to say about bestiality: the Germanic myths and the classical Greco-Roman literature. In the Germanic myths, heroes were described as having characteristics of strength or ruthlessness as a result of having an animal ancestor. For example, the founder of the Danish royal house was said to have been the offspring of a bear and a woman (Salisbury, 1994). In his extensive work on the history of the Scandinavian people, the Swedish Catholic priest, Olaus Magnus, (published in Italy in 1555) wrote about a Swedish farmer’s daughter who was abducted by a bear. The bear was overcome by her beauty and fell in love with her. After a while, the bear was killed by hunters, and the girl gave birth to a son with human appearance. The son took revenge on his father’s slayers, and later became the ancestor of the Danish royal family. The story was first told by Saxo Grammaticus in his *Gesta Danorum*, dating back to the late 12th century (Liliequist, 1988). In the classical Greco-Roman tradition, as mentioned above, gods appeared regularly as animals to have intercourse with humans. As the early church fathers wrestled with this classical heritage and selected those elements suitable for Christianity, they rejected this intimate relationship between humans and animals. Christian texts were shaped by the Christian ideal that humans and animals were, and should remain, separate and humans should thus not have sexual relations with animals (Salisbury, 1994).

The early pagan Germanic secular law codes, in spite of offering detailed information and regulation about daily life, did not prohibit bestiality. Salisbury (1994) suggests that this omission resulted from the fact that no one cared whether people had sexual relations with animals or not. As soon as Christian legislation appeared, prohibitions against bestiality appeared, suggesting that the activity was indeed going on (Salisbury, 1994).

The early church fathers included the Jewish laws against bestiality, and made them a little stricter. Sex with another species did not serve reproduction and was therefore strictly forbidden. The Christians also changed the Old Testament sentence of death by stoning to sentence of death at the stake (Dekkers, 1994). It is therefore paradoxical that the early treatise on English law, *Fleta*, composed about 1290, included the Jews themselves: Sexual relations between a Christian and a Jew was held to be equivalent to “buggery” with animals, and both those who have sexual relations with Jews, and those who commit bestiality and sodomy should be buried alive (Davies, 1982; Ford & Beach, 1951; Greenland, 1983). Johannes Alardus or Jean Alard, for example, who kept a Jewish woman in his house in Paris, and had several children by her, was convicted of sodomy and both were burned, since intercourse with a Jew was considered precisely the same as if a man

should copulate with a dog (Evans, 1987). The Flemish jurist Joost de Damhoudere in the 16th century, counted coitus between a Christian and a Jew as sodomy as well. Coitus with a Jew was considered exactly the same as if a man were to copulate with a dog (Dekkers, 1994).

According to Salisbury (1994), formal conciliar decrees, originating mostly in the Byzantine Empire and the Holy Land, greatly influenced the development of early Christian legislation on sexual behavior. Among its sexual regulations, the Council of Ancyra, in 314, prescribed strict penalties against bestiality: 15 years of penance for individuals under twenty, 25 years for married people over 20, and for a married person over 50, he or she had to wait until the end of life to receive communion. Basil of Caesarea continued Eastern prohibitions in a letter written in 375, which acquired the weight of conciliar decree in the Greek East by the sixth century. This letter called for 15 years of penance. In spite of strict Eastern conciliar legislation, the Greek church never feared sexual relations with animals as much as the West. It seemed no more disruptive to society and the marriage bond than other sexual alternatives. Thus in the East, churchmen repeatedly lowered the strict penances that remained on the books from conciliar legislation. For example, the Eastern father Basil seemed to have considered all sexual sins as one category, linking bestiality, homosexuality, and adultery together, and assigning all three the same penance. In the West, however, over time churchmen looked at the act with increasing concern (Salisbury, 1994).

Salisbury (1994) goes on to explain that the penitentials began in Ireland as a way to offer the churchmen manuals for healing the souls of sinful parishioners. The many penitentials portrayed various attitudes and required different penalties for sexual “sins,” including bestiality. The early Germanic world viewed animals primarily as property and food, and this attitude was reflected in the view of the early Irish penitentials. The earliest penitentials ranked bestiality close to masturbation, making it a mild sexual sin (Salisbury, 1994). For example, according to Hamilton (1981), an early Welsh penitential, the Preface of St. Gildas (495-570), required a year of penance to expiate the sin of bestiality. However, if the man had been living by himself when it happened, three 40-day periods of fasting served as sufficient penance. The Welsh Synod of the Grove of Victory (circa 567) listed two and a half years of penance for those engaged in bestiality (Hamilton, 1981). Salisbury (1994) adds that in the Penitential of Columbanus (circa 591) both masturbation and bestiality received a penalty of six months or a year, depending on marital status. In the influential Cummean Penitential (circa 660), a 15 year old boy engaging in bestiality or mutual masturbation before communion would receive a 40-day penance in either case. This same penitential prescribed seven years for anal intercourse among humans (Salisbury, 1994), and two years for interfemoral (between the legs) intercourse (Hamilton, 1981). Another early Welsh penitential, however, The Book of David from the sixth century, required a lifetime of penance for bestiality, as it did for fornication with a nun (Gregersen, 1983; Hamilton, 1981).

As implied above, the penitentials believed that the sin of bestiality was greater if an individual violated the marital bond by having sexual relations with an animal. Churchmen might have shown some understanding for the sexual sins of a youth, but once a man had taken up the responsibilities of age and marriage, his sexual energies were expected to be channeled only through the marital bond (Salisbury, 1994). This, however, was not always the case; a sixth-century Irish penitential attributed to St. Columban, one of the Irish monks who acted as missionaries to the Germans, required a one year penance for bestiality if the man had a wife. If he did not have a wife, the penance was a year and a half. The same penalties were prescribed for masturbation, and both activities were regarded more lightly than sexual relations with a person of the same gender (Hamilton, 1981).

Churchmen were supposed to be more spiritual than lay people. Thus, if they engaged in bestiality, clergy were to add one year to the lay person’s penalty. That would bring the penalty up to two and a half years or three years. In other words, factors of age, marital status, and ecclesiastical rank served to increase or decrease penances for all sexual sins (Salisbury, 1994).

The casual attitude toward animals and sexual relations with them began to change as the conciliar legislation from the East began to influence the penitential compilers. The Council of Ancyra equated bestiality with homosexuality, and this association reached Visigothic Spain as early as the late sixth century with Martin of Braga. This shaped the Spanish penitentials from the seventh or early eighth centuries, which gave a 20-year penance for those who committed either sodomy or bestiality (Salisbury, 1994).

The later Irish penitentials slowly became influenced by the Council of Ancyra. As they were affected by the conciliar decrees, the intolerant penitentials shifted their perspective on the nature of bestiality. Equating homosexuality with bestiality not only increased the penalty, but it communicated a change in the way people looked at animals. Instead of being an irrelevant object, the animal became a partner in an “unnatural” act, just as homosexuality was considered an “unnatural” act between two partners (Salisbury, 1994).

The St. Hubert Penitential of the mid-ninth century distinguished between sexual relations with “clean” and “unclean” animals, prescribing a penance of 12 years for the former and 15 for the latter. The Eastern Slavic penitentials, influenced by the Council of Ancyra, also distinguished among animals, prescribing a greater penalty for intercourse with a mammal than with a fowl, without explaining the reasons for the differentiation (Salisbury, 1994).

After the animal became a participant as in the equivalent of a homosexual encounter, churchmen turned to Leviticus and found that the animal should be put to death. As churchmen increased their fear of the sin of bestiality, the animal participants were given greater importance. Ivo of Chartres (circa 1090) explained that the animal must be killed to erase any memory of the act. Ivo’s explanation made the killing important for the surviving humans (Salisbury, 1994).

In Egbert’s Penitential, a document of the ninth and 10th centuries, the prison sentence for bestiality varied from 100 days to 10 years (Rosenfeld, 1967). In Theodore’s Penitential, it is said that those who have sexual relations with beasts are subject to 10 years of prison. According to the Penitential Pseudo-Romanum of the 11th century, a layman who fornicated with a mare will receive only one year of prison. The same sentence was given for a man who fornicated with a widow or a virgin (Davis, 1954; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). Copulation with either a sow or a Catholic nun was subject to five years prison (Rosenberger, 1968). Fulbert’s Penitential, from the 11th century, ordered seven years of prison for either bestiality or sodomy. Burchard’s Penitential assigned 40 days of bread and water and seven years of prison (Davis, 1954; Rosenfeld, 1967), which was raised to 10 years in the case of a married man (Davis, 1954). A woman having intercourse with a horse was subject to 15 years in prison, according to Rosenfeld (1967), and to seven years according to Davis (1954).

According to Salisbury (1994), church legislation also influenced secular laws. The Norwegian laws of the 11th century forbade men to have sexual relations with animals, and prescribed the severe penalty of castration and outlawry. Scandinavian society had a long tradition of using attributions of bestial intercourse as insults, and the late 13th century Spanish law code, *Siete Partidas*, expressed the increasingly repressive attitude toward homosexuality and bestiality. It called for the death penalty for both sexual crimes (Salisbury, 1994).

A major question which pre-occupied the inquisitors, judges, theologians, and those who condemned witches, was whether the union of male or female witches with the Devil, under the disguise of an animal, was able to produce any offspring (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933). Gerald of Wales, a 12th century chronicler, reported in his work *The History and Topography of Ireland* about men who had intercourse with cows, and women who had intercourse with goats and a lion. Gerald further recounted tales about half-human births which resulted from such intercourse (Salisbury, 1994). Other examples of the myth of human-animal impregnation and birth are found in the literature: In 1110, in the Borg of Liege, Belgium, there was a creature with the head, hands, and feet of a human being, and the rest of its body was that of a pig (Masters, 1966). A woman in Switzerland gave birth to a lion in 1278, and in 1471, another woman was said to have given birth to a dog in Pavia, Italy. In 1531, that same woman was said to have given birth to a male head enveloped in a film, a serpent with two feet, and to a pig (Blake, 1972; Dubois-Desaulle, 1933). In 1547, at Cracovia (Cracow, Poland), a strange creature was born, which lived three days. It had a man’s head, an elephant’s trunk, “the hands” and feet of a goose, and a tail with a hook on it (Masters, 1966). It was also a common idea from medieval times that the “negro” nation was the result of the mating of a woman with an ape (Allen, 1979).

As the lines between the species seemed to blur, legislation against bestiality increased in an attempt to separate humans and animals (Salisbury, 1994). Twelfth century people seemed to worry more about demons than before, and this attitude contributed to increasing ecclesiastical concern with bestial intercourse. While in the early medieval world, churchmen did not believe that demons could physically interfere with humans since they were made of air, by the 12th century, incubi and succubi — male and female angels cast out of heaven because of their lust — seemed everywhere to seduce women and men, and would even procreate. In the popular imagination, the devil could appear as almost any animal, but most often as a serpent, goat, or dog.

Therefore, the word attached to the sin of demon intercourse was bestiality. During the 12th century, all “unnatural” intercourse began to be linked with promiscuity and infidelity, and bestiality became linked to infidelity with the devil (Montclair, 1997; Rosenfeld, 1967; Salisbury, 1994).

By the 13th century, the animal world seemed much more threatening than it had in the early Middle Ages. Now animals were believed to be able to mingle with humanity and to create offspring. Thomas of Chobham (circa 1158-1233) identified bestiality as a grave sin calling for extreme penalties. The individual was required to do penance for 15 years, or 20 if he or she was married, and in addition, to go barefoot throughout his or her life, never enter church, and permanently abstain from meat, fish, and intoxicants. The animal was to be killed, burned, and buried to prevent any memory of the crime. Alexander of Hales (1245), identified bestiality as the greatest sin against nature, “for to sin with ‘another species’ and with ‘things irrational’ represents the furthest departure from human nature, and thus the most unnatural sin” (Salisbury, 1994, p. 99). The penalty proscribed by Alexander was death for both the human and the animal (Salisbury, 1994).

The idea that sexual union between man and animal may result in offspring shaped the composition of the *Summae Theologica*, by Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274), which represented the highest development of medieval thought (Salisbury, 1994). St. Thomas identified four kinds of unnatural vice: The most serious sin against nature was bestiality, followed by homosexuality, intercourse in an “unnatural position” (anything other than the missionary position), and masturbation. The attitudes of St. Thomas tended to dominate all thinking on sexual behavior to the end of the Middle Ages, resulting in classifying as deviant any kind of non-procreative sexual activity (Hamilton, 1981; Salisbury, 1994).

In France, in 1300, all “sins against nature” by a man over twenty years of age, including zoophilia, had to be referred to the bishop (Tannahill, 1992). The Roman Catholic Church has further held that touching the genitalia of an animal, even out of curiosity, may be sinful. Touching the genitalia of an animal “with lust” may constitute a mortal (grave) sin (Dekkers, 1994; Ellison, 1970; Hunt, 1974; Kinsey et al., 1953). Catholic theologians tended for a time to take the view that bestiality was a crime against God, and therefore the punishment was divine, hence death (Masters, 1962). Dubois-Desaulle (1933) further suggests that in the Catholic mind, it was the Divine Person who was offended, since the act of bestiality was equated with commerce with the Devil. Salisbury (1994) points out, however, that although Aquinas ranked bestiality as the worst, in practice the courts were more preoccupied with prosecuting homosexuality.

According to Dubois-Desaulle (1933) and Niemoeller (1946), those who were accused of engaging in bestiality had little hope for a hearing on the merits of the case. Criminal law of this period had two types of torture: preparatory torture and definitive torture, which were each divided into two sub-classes: ordinary torture and extraordinary torture. Tortures varied from place to place. For example, the parliament of Paris admitted only torture by water and by the boot. The Parliament of Norceu, France, added to the water torture, thumb-screws. In this form of torture, the victim’s thumbs were placed in a kind of small screw-vice which was then clamped down to the point of cracking the bones. At Dieppe, France, the accused was suspended by the nails with pincers. At Metz, France, sharp blades were inserted under the nails. This was done to elicit a confession. After conviction had been achieved, the punishment had two main elements: capital and monetary. Capital punishment was done through burning, and later by strangling and then burning. Often, the animal that had been used for the sexual act was burned in the same fire that consumed the individual (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Niemoeller, 1946). Often, the accused man was strung up on a ladder in the great square of the town, and the animal was burned in his presence. Then the person was hanged and strangled, after which his body was thrown into the same fire which had burnt the animal. Sometimes, the person was first roasted a little, then strangled, and finally burned. The animal was usually killed by a blow to the head before going into the fire. The trial papers were often also thrown into the fire, to leave no trace of the abominable crime (Dekkers, 1994). Commonly, the accused person was also supposed to pay back the plaintiff for the cost of the animal and for the costs of the trial, before he was put to death (Evans, 1987).

The Renaissance Period in Europe

During the late Middle Ages and Renaissance, authorities began active prosecution of homosexuality and bestiality. The high point of bestiality trials more or less coincided with that of the witch-hunts (Dekkers,

1994). In Europe, in the 15th century, there were reported instances of men being executed for bestiality with cows (Bagley, 1968), and trial records of Majorca, Spain, show that several people were executed for the crime of bestiality (Salisbury, 1994). During the 15th and 16th centuries, sexual relations with animals formed one of the main topics for preachers (Davies, 1954; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). According to Rosenberger (1968), however, those who confessed about engaging in sexual relations with animals, in the confessional, received merely a penance — to say so many prayers a day, and so forth.

According to Dubois-Desaulle (1933), from the 13th to the 15th centuries, love of goats was an epidemic in Italy. Ellis (in Niemoeller, 1946b), reported that Italian auxiliaries, in the south of France, during the 16th century, were accustomed to bringing and using goats for the purpose of satisfying their sexual passions (Davis, 1954; Ellis in Niemoeller, 1946b).

In 15th century Italy, Cesare Borgia, the illegitimate son of the Pope Alexander VI, was accused of murder, rape, incest, robbery, bestiality and much more (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992d). In 1453, a priest was sentenced, executed, and burned at Evreux, France, because he kissed the Devil, in the form of a sheep, under the tail. In 1468, a married, 24 year old man, from the village of Megnanville, France, was accused and convicted of having twice carnally known a cow that he owned. He also confessed to having had sexual relations with a female goat. He and the animals were burned and their bodies reduced to ashes. In 1533, at Blois, France, an Italian of the city of Alexandria was burned because he had intercourse with animals (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933).

By 1534, bestiality became a capital crime in England and Sweden (Salisbury, 1994). A decree of the Parliament of Paris, from 1601, and another of the Parliament of Aix from 1679, ordered that the animals be burned so as not to perpetuate the memory of this crime (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933). On September 12, 1606, the mayor of Loens de Chartres, France, condemned a man named Guillaume Guyart to be hanged and strangled. A bitch, his accomplice, was sentenced to be knocked on the head by the executioner of high justice, and the dead bodies of the two were to be burned and reduced to ashes. Killing animals by striking a blow to their heads seems to have been a very common practice (Evans, 1987). In 1683, Denmark passed a law making both homosexuality and bestiality punishable by burning. In 1711, it was decided that those convicted should be strangled as well as burned (L'Etalon Doux, 1996).

In his original work from 1905, Dubois-Desaulle (1933) recorded the proceedings of 40 bestiality trials appearing before the old French courts of the 16th and 17th centuries, from the collection of documents gathered by the Procurer of the King, Gueullette, in 1739. Of those 40 condemnations, 12 were sentenced to be burned alive and 28 to be hanged and strangled. However, after decrees of Parliament only four were burned alive (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933). Love (1992) points out that during the 17th century, the incidence of bestiality between young boys, cows, and sheep became so prevalent that the Catholic Church tried to ban the employment of male herdsmen.

According to Monter (1981) who compared recorded sodomy trials in Geneva and Fribourg, in Geneva, bestiality was relatively unimportant during the 16th century, and there was only one known trial and no known death. Bestiality, however, became more significant after 1610. Three men were burned for it between 1614 and 1617, and three of the final five 17th century trials were for bestiality. The author suggests that to some extent, this increase in the apparent prevalence of bestiality was due to the rural environment intruding into the history of the Genevan urban state (Monter, 1981).

Apart from one 15th century case, all the recorded sodomy trials in early modern Fribourg dated from the first half of the 17th century, and all were for bestiality rather than homosexuality. Monter (1981) suggests that a pastoral economy is most likely to produce a pastoral sexual deviation. From the summer of 1599 to the spring of 1648, Fribourg's Council minutes contained references to 32 sodomy trials. Then, there were no more recorded trials for sodomy. Recorded sodomy trials declined after 1650 at both Fribourg and Geneva. In general, sodomy trials ended at approximately the same time as did witchcraft trials (Monter, 1981).

In Sweden, bestiality was made a capital crime first in the provincial laws of the late 13th and 14th centuries, and later in Christoffer's landsag in 1442. Although bestiality was made a capital crime already in the late Middle Ages, it was not until the beginning of the 17th century that charges of bestiality occurred frequently (Liliequist, 1988).

In the great witch-trials in the middle and northern parts of Sweden, between 1668-1676, the people believed that the devil was often appearing as a black dog sitting under a table. The witches were said to go under the table and copulate with him. Sometimes they would fight each other to decide who would be the first (Liliequist, 1988).

Liliequist (1988) analyzed 1074 death penalty cases sentenced by the Superior Court Svea Hovratt in Sweden, based on letters from the court to the executive authorities, between 1634 and 1756. He found that overall, far more individuals were executed for bestiality than for witchcraft in Sweden, totaling between 500 and 600 people. Many more animals, primarily cows, heifers, mares, sheep, goats, sows, bitches, and dogs, were also executed. Almost all the convicted individuals were young men (Liliequist, 1988).

Europe in the Modern Era and Today

In European history, as mentioned above, cases of bestiality are particularly common in court records. Hundreds of reports have survived from the boom in bestiality trials from the 16th to the 18th centuries (Dekkers, 1994), demonstrating that bestiality was well-established in ordinary life in Europe (Davis, 1954; Niemoeller, 1946b).

Apart from the belief that bestiality cures sexually transmitted diseases, there was a common belief in Europe that venereal diseases came into being when a man had sexual relations with a mare at the Siege of Naples — the diseases being formerly of mares or horses only — and then were spread when that individual had sexual relations with other humans (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962). An English physician, John Lindner, held that syphilis resulted from anal intercourse committed with large apes (Masters, 1962).

Bledsoe (1964) and Maybury (1968) relate that in the 17th and 18th centuries, there was a European practice which consisted of women covering their bodies with rags that had been in contact with the genitals of mares, goats, and female dogs in heat. These rags were used to arouse stallions and rams to copulate with their own kind. The women would then watch the sexually aroused stallions, masturbate, and often have intercourse with the rams.

Bagley (1968) reports that in Belgium, in the 17th century, it was reported that a human child was born of a cow which had been impregnated by a man. The child grew up liking to eat grass and often chewed his cud. In 1726, a woman named Mary Tofts of Surrey, England, became internationally famous by claiming that she gave birth to rabbits (Blake, 1972). Waine (1968) further relates that the Norwegians once (the author does not specify when) crowned a dog King, who was surrounded by “the loveliest girls in the land... and... well serviced” (p. 39).

Exhibitions of animal intercourse have always been popular, and were especially so in modern times in France and England of the 18th century, when the nobility was delighted in witnessing the copulations of stallions with mares (Masters, 1962). Also in the 18th century, Sicilian priests routinely inquired of herdsmen in confession if they had had any commerce with their sows. The priests in Normandy were advised to ask similar questions (Davis, 1954; Niemoeller, 1946b).

Parisian brothels were known to provide turkeys for their clients. As the men were about to experience orgasm through having intercourse with the turkey, they would break the neck of the bird, causing the bird’s cloaca sphincter to constrict and spasm, clamping down on their penises and creating pleasurable sensations. A similar activity was enjoyed by ancient Chinese men whose animal of preference was a goose (De Sade in Dekkers, 1994; De Sade in Edwardes & Masters, 1977; Love, 1992). It was also reported that Persians used to cure gonorrhea by means of “bestiality therapy” (Masters, 1962).

According to Niemoeller (1946b), bestiality has been quite prevalent in France since the 19th century. In earlier times, it used to be common in French villages to see a woman and a donkey copulate for a small sum (Chideckel, 1938). In 19th century France, bestiality became an organized practice. In Paris, at the time of Napoleon III, it was one of the allied activities of the Society for the Advancement of Sodomy that met regularly in the Allees des Veuves and had orgies that involved animals (A. F. N. in Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Niemoeller, 1946b). There are reports from a French court about several ladies who gathered in a large room,

raised their skirts, spread their legs, and held contests to see which of their trained Pekinese dogs first brought its lady to orgasm (Bledsoe, 1964; Somers, 1966).

According to Somers (1966), notable public display of bestiality was one of the many factors which led to the French Revolution. Yet, Gregersen (1983) points out that the French Revolution provided the first major break with western tradition concerning sex laws, when Church and State, morality and law, and God and the Commandments became separated (Dekkers, 1994). In 1810, an important revision of the laws appeared — the Napoleonic code. The most significant feature of this code, from the point of view of sex crimes, was that sexual behavior in private between consenting adults was decriminalized and bestiality was no longer considered a crime (Gregersen, 1983). Since that time, the subject of bestiality has never been included in the civil code of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, Belgium, and the Netherlands (Dekkers, 1994), although certain acts continued to be punishable, if they involved violence or occurred in a public place. Many western countries, with the exception of a few such as England and the United States, followed suit, at least in the elimination of the death penalty (Gregersen, 1983).

After the English Reformation, an act of Parliament from Henry VIII's reign laid down the death penalty for the act of buggery committed with humans or beasts (Davies, 1982). In 1821, the law in England read: "Any person, who commits the crime of sodomy, either with a man, or with any animal, and is found guilty, will be put to death" (L'Etalon Doux, 1996). Thus, homosexuality and bestiality were classed together in the single category of buggery (Davies, 1982). This law was revised in 1861, and the sentence reduced to life imprisonment, a punishment that remains to this day (L'Etalon Doux, 1996). Nevertheless, since in England bestiality is lumped together with homosexuality as "sodomy," the prosecution of the former has declined with that of the latter (Dekkers, 1994).

Using legal records from the county of Somerset, England, between the years 1740 and 1850, Morris (1988) found that 25 men were charged with attempting or committing bestiality. Most of the men were young and came from small rural parishes. Of the 25 men, 18 were identified as laborers. The animals involved in the men's sexual activities were common farm animals. Eight men were found guilty: six of attempting bestiality and two of committing it. Morris (1988) points out that while the evidence for a link between sodomy and blackmail in Somerset existed, it did not for bestiality, even though this activity may have been equally damaging to a man's reputation. The author speculates that the lack of blackmail in bestiality cases may have resulted from the age and class of many of the offenders, as their youth and financial circumstances would have made them inappropriate targets for blackmail (Morris, 1988).

It was reported that Russian officers in the Turkish campaign of 1828, who feared venereal disease in Wallachia, refrained from intercourse with women but often engaged in sexual relations with female asses (Davis, 1954; Ellis in Rosenfeld, 1967). One of the persistent legends of history attributes the death of the Russian empress Catherine the Great to an accident while attempting to have sexual relations with a bull or a horse. The sling broke, and the weight of the animal crushed her (Bullough in Matthews, 1994; Cornog & Perper, 1994; Friday, 1981). Also, of the inhabitants of Kamchatka in north-east Siberia, the women were formerly known to be "greatly addicted to vice with dogs" (Bloch, 1933, p. 53; Masters, 1962).

After the French Revolution, Germany also made a division between morality and law, but continued to view bestiality as in conflict with the law (Dekkers, 1994). The German penal code of 1871, revised in 1876, in its Article 175 states that acts against nature with animals shall be punished by imprisonment, and the convicted individual shall be deprived of his civil rights (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933). Until long after World War II, farmers in the German-speaking cantons of Switzerland were much less free to take liberties with their cattle than their French-speaking neighbors. Until 1969, anyone in Germany touching the genitalia of an animal risked not only a prison sentence but also the loss of his civil and political rights (Dekkers, 1994). According to L'Etalon Doux (1996), bestiality stopped being a crime in West Germany in 1969 due to "lack of use." In the former Eastern (communist) half of Germany, bestiality was not considered an offense (L'Etalon Doux, 1996).

The Hungarian penal code of 1878 carries the maximum penalty of one-year imprisonment for sexual relations with animals (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933). Hirschfeld (in Niemoeller, 1946b) points out that during World War I, Hungarian hussars used their mares for sexual purposes.

In 1917, the Soviet Union started what was called a sexual revolution, and incest, bigamy, polygamy, adultery, homosexuality, and bestiality were removed from the penal code. This revolution resulted in a

bourgeois morality, but the Stalin regime brought back, and even strengthened, many of the old laws (Gregersen, 1983).

An article in the *New York World-Telegram* of December 30, 1932, related that an address was delivered on that date by Dr. H. S. England before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in which he revealed that Dr. Elie Ivanoff, of Moscow, was experimenting with producing a hybrid between man and ape. The project was financed by the Soviet government, and the experiment was taking place in the wilds of Turkestan with nine female chimpanzees. The experiment was conducted through artificial insemination (A. F. N. in Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Bagley, 1968; Blake, 1972; Niemoeller, 1946b). There has been no further reference to this experiment (Masters, 1962; Masters, 1966).

In the above-mentioned address delivered in Atlantic City, in 1932, Dr. England further reported that the late biologist of Berlin, Dr. Herman Klaatsch, had conceived the idea of hybridizing the gorilla with the natives of what was then German West Africa, for the purpose of producing workmen with powerful muscles and primitive minds. This project was halted by World War I (A. F. N. in Dubois-Desaulle, 1933), and apparently was not resumed (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962).

During World War II, human-animal breeding experiments were conducted by Dr. Josef Mengele, a Nazi physician of the notorious Auschwitz concentration and extermination camp. He was reported to be obsessed with bestiality, and was bent on creating a hybrid that could eventually replace slave labor for menial tasks. He used the large camp source of young Jewish and Polish girls in the Auschwitz concentration camp for this purpose. Mengele had his St. Bernard, Baron, copulate with approximately 500 female prisoners. He constructed a special rack for this purpose, where the woman was firmly strapped, with her legs spread wide (Blake, 1972; Rosenfeld, 1967; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992c).

Dr. Mengele also had ponies have sexual intercourse with women. Another special rack was constructed for that purpose. Often, however, the part of the rack supporting the pony and preventing it from inserting his whole penis gave way. The pony's penis then ruptured the victim, who would bleed to death, while Dr. Mengele stood calmly by, taking notes (Rosenfeld, 1967; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992c). The editor of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1992c) points out that it is interesting to note that most historical accounts of Dr. Mengele ignore his bestiality crimes and obsession. He suggests that perhaps they were too taboo for the popular press at the time.

Mengele's girlfriend, Irma Grese, who was an SS prison guard, in charge of 18,000 female prisoners at Auschwitz, would also use Baron as a sexual, sadistic agent on her prisoners (Rosenfeld, 1967). Klaus Barbie, the infamous "Butcher of Lyons," used to force female prisoners to perform sex acts with animals as a means of degrading them, according to war crimes testimony. Over the years, there have also been persistent rumors that Hitler's mistress, Eva Braun, engaged in sex acts with dogs (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992c).

Sex circuses which present sexual relations with animals as part of their show, were common in Paris, at least during World War II (Rosenfeld, 1967). In modern times, Aleister Crowley, the organizer of "Love is the law" cult in Sicily, had his mistress and other female members of the cult engage in acts of bestiality with his selected sacred goat (Bagley, 1968).

In 1963, a French anthropologist and biologist, Dr. Gustav Monteil, of the Rhodes-Livingstone Medical Centre in Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia, attempted to crossbreed humans with anthropoid apes. He argued that the apes' blood and chromosome number are the same as in the human being (Masters, 1966). No further information was available on this project. Moreover, an (unknown) German survey conducted in 1989, covering some 3000 adults, showed that three percent of men and two percent of women admitted to having had sex with animals (L'Etalon Doux, 1996).

According to Rosenberger (1968), bestiality is still very common in Europe. In Sicily, and parts of France, Germany, and Poland, priests still ask in the confessional if one has used an animal for "bestial purposes of sex" (Rosenberger, 1968, p. 28). In Sicily and southern Italy, bestiality among herdsmen has been said to be of such proportions that it has been considered a national custom (Davis, 1954; Ellis in Niemoeller, 1946b). According to Bloch (1933), bestiality with nanny goats still occurs in south Italy. In the northern part of Europe, it is reported that the reindeer takes the place of the goat in Italy (Davis, 1954), and although he had

never witnessed it for himself, Bloch (in Davis, 1954) states that in Bosnia, women sometimes copulate with dogs and cats.

According to *The Wild Animal Revue* (1994/95), dog, snake, and pony sex shows exist in Italy. Both local and Libyan girls are employed for this purpose. There have also been at least two Italian animal pornographic films made involving horses. In Greece, although enforcement of moral laws is very strict, pony, donkey, and dog sex shows are still known to run from time to time. Cyprus offers dog, pony, and snake exhibitions. "Oriental girls" are hired as entertainers, have their passports taken, and are forced into prostitution and into performing in sex shows (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

Dumont (1970) discusses the "sexual resorts" found in Spain, where wealthy women are able to enjoy their bestial interests without interference. According to *The Wild Animal Revue* (1994/95), in Spain and Portugal, animal sex shows are run by local, Gypsy, North African and Arabic girls. There is a recent report of monkey sex shows in the south, with North African and Arabic women (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

In England, dog, goat, pony, and bull sex shows have been documented in police records. Most shows are run by foreign nationals with girls from third world countries, usually non-English speaking. France is the same as England when it comes to sex shows, with additional snake and donkey sex shows. In Germany and Austria, there are dog, goat, and pony sex shows. The girls are usually Eastern European, Russian or Turkish. There are recent reports of Turks putting on underground shows in Germany, with various exotic animals, imported and trained just for those shows. No live animal sex shows are known in Belgium and Luxembourg (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

In the Netherlands, anything is available concerning sex shows, and the sex acts with animals are both homosexual and heterosexual (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Issue number 8 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1992d) describes live animal sex shows in Holland. In Scandinavia, not a lot is reported about animal sex shows, in spite of the lack of censorship and the generally relaxed attitude in Denmark (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Denmark is probably the only place where bestiality videos are legally produced and distributed. Issue number 1 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1991) depicts an interview with Bodil Joensen, a Danish woman who has appeared in many animal pornographic movies. Magazines depicting pictures of sexual relations between humans and animals, such as *Animal Bizarre*, *Animal Special*, *Dog Instruction*, and *Donkey Sex* are very popular in Denmark (Donofrio, 1996). There is one report of a reindeer sex show in Norway, and there is a total suppression of all "deviant" sexual activity in Finland (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

Since the wall went down in Eastern Europe, there are increasing reports on all aspects of the sex industry, including dog and pony sex shows, as yet unconfirmed. The girls who are used for this purpose are local. Lately, there is an influx of Russian dog sex tapes, which may indicate that the same sources have been putting on shows as well. Hungary has the same generally relaxed attitude to sex as does Denmark, yet it is only rumor that Budapest is supposed to be the "hotbed" of wild sex in Eastern Europe (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

Also, in Germany, there is the Interessengemeinschaft Zoophiler Menschen (IZM — zoophile interest group) which is a support group for zoophiles (Stasya, 1996).

South and East Asia and Oceania

Bullough (1976) relates that sexual relations with animals is not reported in Chinese annals or literature, and Dekkers (1994) states that there are few reports of bestiality from ancient China. Allen (1979), on the other hand, reports that the Chinese have the reputation for indulgence in "bestiosexuality," and blames customs and prohibitions which prevent the young man from mating with a "normal love object." According to Rosenberger (1968), bestiality is more common in the East than it is in the West. In fact, he relates that in the East, bestiality is the rule and not the exception (Rosenberger, 1968), and Rosenfeld (1967) adds that among ancient peoples, the Chinese are noted for their acts of intercourse with animals. In its 17 volumes which were published in London by the Burton Club, between the years 1885-1888, *Thousand Nights and a Night*, translated by the British explorer and orientalist, Sir Richard F. Burton, Chinese systematic bestiality with ducks, goats, and other animals is discussed (Trimble, 1969; Edwardes & Masters, 1977).

Prince Chien, of the Han dynasty (221 B.C. — 24 A.D.), who was regarded as a sadistic degenerate, is said to have forced women to have intercourse with dogs (Bullough, 1976). Another notorious form of punishment for females in old China was the “punishment by horse cock” (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992b).

According to Waive (1968), in China, sexual relations with canine prospered both in the past and present. In old Shanghai, the exhibit of a young virgin being mounted by a dog was regularly offered in the brothel’s sex shows (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992b). In ancient days, Pekinese dogs were bred and raised by eunuchs under close supervision of the Emperor himself. One of the eunuchs’ daily chores was to stretch the dog’s tongue, massaging and pulling it. The royal preference for Pekinese probably precluded penetration possibilities, but the special treatment given to their tongues, and the common practice of puppy breast-feeding by privileged ladies, indicate dog-human sexual attitudes “beyond the shadow of a doubt” (Waive, 1968, p. 49). The Pekinese was replaced by the Chow-Chow as Imperial Dog in following centuries. According to the testimony of “dog lovers,” the Chow-Chow’s genitals are appropriate for sexual involvement with humans (Waive, 1968).

Other authors indicate that there was once a form of pleasure found among the wealthy and sophisticated men of the East, especially the Chinese. They were famous for their intimate relations with geese, and other birds, whose necks they wrung at the moment of orgasm in order to obtain added stimulation from the final spasms of the animal’s anal sphincter (Davis, 1954; Dekkers, 1994; Greenwood, 1963; Mantegazza, 1932; Mantegazza, 1886 in Edwardes & Masters, 1977; Masters, 1962; Ramsis, 1969; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). This form of bestiality is known as “avisodomy” (Love, 1992).

In the East, the harems were said to be “hotbeds” of bestiality, where the unsatisfied concubines often found baboons far more gratifying than eunuchs or each other’s tongues and fingers (Trimble, 1969). Sultans and other leaders of the East used animals to keep the women of their harems happy and satisfied. They usually kept a large number of giant dogs around to perform cunnilingus on the harem inhabitants. There were also apes that were trained to copulate with the women (Somers, 1966) and with men (Bagley, 1968).

Among the Sedang (or Sedand) Moi of Indochina, it is believed that at some point, everyone was drowned in an overflow, except a dog and a woman, who cohabited and begot children. To this day, Sedang women are prohibited from eating the flesh of dogs because they are considered to be their husbands. The men believe that an animal that has had sexual relations with them may not be sacrificed since it is now the “wife” of a human, thus a human itself (Menninger, 1951). According to Tannahill (1992), the Mongols were and remained notorious for their zoophilic habits, and according to Rosenberger (1968), the Tajiks and Ghilzais of Afghanistan are known to practice bestiality.

Before communism in China, almost any sex show could be seen in Shanghai. Currently no animal sex shows are known to take place in China (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Dubois-Desaulle (1933) states that bestiality is still popular in the Orient, and *The Wild Animal Revue* (1994/95) relates that in Southeast Asia one can find sex shows with barnyard, domestic animals, snakes, and eels. Thailand offers the best sex shows with local girls (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Nowadays, people seek their sexual excitement in cities such as Bangkok, where taxi-drivers openly display on their dashboards a list of places that show various sexual specialities, among which is invariably “girl with dog” (Dekkers, 1994). Singapore offers gay animal shows, as well as women-animal shows, with local performers. In Taiwan, dog and snake shows are known to exist, and the former French colonies of the Pacific Islands reportedly offer the best animal sex shows in that area (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

According to Rosenberger (1968), there is very little bestiality among the Japanese. However, it is reported that an exhibit of a young woman being mounted by a dog is still the ultimate bachelor party extravaganza in modern day Japan, and that American G.I.s in Japan often encountered bestial sex shows (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992b). Trimble (1969) discusses a sex circus that took place in Japan, in the 1960s, and *The Wild Animal Revue* (1993) describes an underground animal sex show in Tokyo, as reported by a reader, demonstrating that sex shows, while discrete and quiet, do exist. Okinawa had a private Habu (local poisonous snake) show as late as 1992 (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

In Korea, one can watch any animal sex show with a local girl (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Issue number 13 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1996) describes such a live sex show in Korea, where women had sex with a goat, as reported by a reader who served in Korea in the mid 1970s.

According to Gregersen (1983), both men and women Marquesans make use of animals for sexual outlets as an emergency practice. Women are known to induce dogs to perform cunnilingus on them, and men commonly copulate with chickens, dogs and horses (Gregersen, 1983). In Sumatra, people are said to be addicted to all kinds of “vicious practices, bestiality among others” (Bloch, 1933, p. 46; Masters, 1962). Some of the Ponape men of the Caroline Islands insert a fish into a woman’s vagina, and then slowly lick and suck it out as a form of foreplay (Love, 1992). Older women among the Trukese often entice dogs to perform cunnilingus on them by putting fresh coconut meat in their vaginas (Gregersen, 1983).

In the Philippine Islands there are water buffalo, dog, pony, snake, and eel sex shows with local girls. The “best places” are Manila and United States base areas. There is a reported monkey sex show outside of Cebu City (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Issue number 12 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1995) describes a live sex show with a bull on a farm outside of Baguio, a resort, a few hours north of Manila, as reported by a reader who saw that sex show over twenty years ago.

In Australia and New Zealand, dog, goat, pony, and bull sex shows exist. Shows are reportedly conducted in the background of some of the larger cities. Some ranches and sheep stations are reported to have goat and ram shows (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Also, it is reported that the Aborigines of Australia are known to practice bestiality (Rosenberger, 1968).

Bestiality was very common among the Hindus (Rosenfeld, 1967). The Code of Manu, the first systematic coding of Hindu law, dating from about the first century A.D., reads: “A man who has committed a bestial crime... shall perform a Samtapana Krikkhra” (Bullough, 1976, p. 247). However, according to Bullough (1976), bestiality was tolerated under certain conditions in India, and Kautilya fined a person who copulated with animals only 12 panas, which was much less than for anal intercourse among humans. According to Rosenberger (1968), bestialists have never been punished in India.

Portrayals of animal/human sexual contacts frequently appear in temple sculptures all over India (Bullough, 1976; Rosenfeld, 1967). Bullough (1976) points out that these may be more symbolic than representative of real life activities. The most vivid portrayals of bestiality are seen in the sculpture at the Black Pagoda at Konarak and in some of the temples at Bhuvanesvar (Bullough, 1976). Tantrism often portrayed man as a rabbit, bull or horse, and the woman as a doe, mare, or a female elephant. Individuals with animal faces are often pictured copulating, and Bullough (1976) suggests that in these cases, not all such representations are symbolic. Among the supernatural powers promised to practitioners of various yogic disciplines are those by which a person could become a beast, so that he could have sex with animals, and thereby experience sex in its totality (Bullough, 1976).

In an early legend, Prajapati was said to have cohabited with the dawn goddess Ushas, who tried to escape him by assuming hundreds of different animal shapes. It was through such copulations that all animal species were produced. In Hindu mythology, Mallika, the wife of Prasenajit, used a pet dog for her sexual gratification and Prasenajit sought satisfaction with a goat (Bullough, 1976). There is a belief among some Indian people that they have descended from a woman of great beauty who copulated with a dog of very great stature and remarkable vigor (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Niemoeller, 1946b).

It was reported that in India pet dogs and monkeys were kept in harems to service the women (Bullough, 1976, Ramsis, 1969), and that in the Indus Valley, monkeys were trained to “manipulate” the genitals of both men and women (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962).

According to Donofrio (1996), in ancient India, the belief in transmigration of souls between animals and humans was combined with acceptance toward bestiality. According to Somers (1966), sexual relations with animals was accepted in India as a permissible sexual outlet, provided that the person had exhausted all options for human sexual contact. Sex with animals has always had special significance among the Hindus (Christy, 1967), especially among Hindu holy men (Masters, 1962). According to the Hindu tradition of erotic painting and sculpture, a human copulating with an animal is actually a human having intercourse with a god incarnated in the form of an animal (Money, 1986). Copulation with a sacred cow or monkey is believed to bring good fortune (Christy, 1967; Edwardes, 1959). “Many city youths have their first orgasm dangling from the rump of a sacred cow” (Christy, 1967, p. 146), although in an article on sexual problems of adolescence in India, Nagaraja (1983) states that only one percent of the adolescent population suffers from the “abnormal desire” of bestiality (Nagaraja, 1983). Bagley (1968) reports that Hindu holy men had bestial relationships with

sacred monkeys, and Rosenberger (1968) relates about the Hindus' celebrations at the Holi festival, to honor the Goddess Vesanti. During this holiday, open human sexual relations are wildly practiced. Hindu males also reportedly copulate with cows and Hindu women masturbate and perform fellatio on bulls in order to be closer to God (Rosenberger, 1968).

The Wild Animal Revue (1994/95) reports that in the Indian Ocean area, various animal sex shows with local girls are offered for tourists. Occasional water buffalo sex shows are mentioned. In the Indian Sub-continent (India, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan and Sikkim), some sex shows are mentioned with bulls and dogs, and with local, sometimes under-aged girls (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). Among the Tamils of Sri-Lanka, intercourse with goats and cows is said to be very common (Davis, 1954).

Arab Countries, the Middle East, and Africa

According to Rosenfeld (1967) and Rosenberger (1968), the Arabs are the most dedicated bestialists on the face of the earth. Arabs practice bestiality primarily with goats, mares, sheep, sows, and camels, if the latter cooperate. Arab women reportedly have oral sex and intercourse with dogs whenever men are not available to please them (Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). Arab men believe that intercourse with animals increases virility, cures diseases, and enlarges their penises (Bagley, 1968; Dekkers, 1994; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). Reportedly, bestiality is a normal way of life for the Arab. Children who masturbate are laughed at, and thus replace this sexual play with a more acceptable form of sex play — bestiality (Rosenfeld, 1967).

Under Islamic law, the penalty for sodomy with an animal is death (L'Étalon Doux, 1996). Nevertheless, according to Bullough (1976) and Dekkers (1994), bestiality was tolerated in Islam. Although copulation with animals was to be despised, it was still considered better than “zina,” which is adultery or fornication. According to Bullough (1976), Muslims assume a man has sex with an animal only when he is depraved or to prevent himself from committing “zina.” If discovered, the animal was to be destroyed, and eaten, if of an edible species (Bullough, 1976).

Rosenfeld (1967) relates that while the Koran forbids sexual relations with animals, Arabs ignore this religious law and do as they please. Interestingly enough, according to Edwardes (1959), Masters (1962), and Ramsis (1969), the Koran makes no mention of sexual relations with animals. Nevertheless, since bestiality was not specifically prohibited by the Prophet Mohamad, Arabs' attitudes toward bestiality have never been too condemnatory (Masters, 1962). Today, intercourse with animals is considered a matter of personal taste and is at worst a slight sin. In ancient times, however, bestiality led to death by stoning of both man and animal. Through the years, this form of punishment was abandoned (Edwardes, 1959; Ramsis, 1969).

A popular Arab saying is that “the pilgrimage to Mecca is not complete without copulating with the camel” (Bagley, 1968; Edwardes, 1959; Masters, 1962), and Ramsis (1969) points out that the camel and the horse are favorite objects of bestiality to the Arab. Money (1986) reports that there are erotic paintings in the Middle East, three and four centuries old, in which men are depicted copulating with animals, and Braun (1967) and Dekkers (1994) relate a common joke: “Which is the only virgin in Arabia? ... the she-goat because she can run faster than any Arab” (Braun, 1967, p. 58).

According to Waive (1968), Arab nomadic tribes used to indulge in sexual relations with the ass, goat, mare, or young camel. When stationary quarters were used by the Arabs, particularly those set up in areas away from the intense desert heat, the Saluki dog was used almost exclusively for the Arabs' sexual animal appetite (Waive, 1968). Among some nomad tribes, intercourse with cattle is still regarded as a ritual of passage for adolescent males (Bullough, 1976). Bestiality is found only rarely among the Rwala Bedouins, occasionally in Central Arabia, and frequently among the semi-Bedouins of Northern Israel and Mecca (Gregersen, 1983; Masters, 1962). It was also reported that as recently as the early part of this century, the nomads' practice of bestiality with their cattle constituted an ordinary feature of pastoral life among the Palestinian Arabs (Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962), and Braun (1967) points out that Arabs and others in the Middle and Far East are commonly believed to have sexual relations with nanny-goats.

In most Arab countries, young boys still have sex with mares and goats to beautify and enlarge their penises (Bledsoe, 1965). The Moors (Muslims in north-west Africa) believe that having sexual intercourse with

a female ass on three successive days is a cure for gonorrhea (A. F. N. in Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Bagley, 1968; Masters, 1962). Pre-pubescent Moorish boys also have intercourse with female asses in order to acquire sexual capacity and to make their penises grow (A. F. N. in Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Masters, 1962). Boys of the Rif tribe in Morocco and Algeria are known to “sodomize” she-asses believing it will enlarge their penises (Gregersen, 1983). The Muslims of Morocco have a similar belief, whereby fathers encourage sons to practice anal and vaginal intercourse with donkeys in order to make the penis grow (Dekkers, 1994; Edwardes & Masters, 1977; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). Boyhood masturbation is scorned in favor of bestiality, and the sight of a group of young Moroccan boys taking turns mounting a donkey is accepted as merely comical (Edwardes & Masters, 1977). Grown-up men are ridiculed for the practice, but are not punished as long as they perform the act with their own livestock (Masters, 1962). According to Dekkers (1994), in Fez, Moroccan men have magic rites which enable them to have sex with 27 cows in one night. Dumont (1970) relates that there is a “sexual resort” in Tangier where wealthy women enjoy their bestial interests without interference.

According to Ramsis (1969) and Edwardes (1959), it is popular among Arabs to roll sleeping female crocodiles onto their backs, where they are helpless, and to have sex with them. This form of bestiality probably has religious roots. Legend has it that intercourse with a crocodile secures everlasting prosperity and virility (Edwardes, 1959; Ramsis, 1969).

The King of Persia (circa 500 B.C.) trained warrior dogs and rewarded them by allowing the dogs to rape human slave girls (Waine, 1968). According to some earlier writers, Persians still practice bestiality as a cure for gonorrhea (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Krafft-Ebing, 1935). During the 1978 American conflict with Iran, the *Little Green Book*, with extracts from the writings of Ayatollah Khomeini was published. This book contains traditional ritualistically correct views on various issues, among them what to do with a sodomized camel (Gregersen, 1983).

Bestiality is common among the Turks (Rosenfeld, 1967), who are known for having anal intercourse with mares (Bagley, 1968). A Turkish legend tells how ancestors of the Turks had been slaughtered in battle, leaving only one survivor, a small boy. A female wolf brought him food and fought off a soldier who was sent to kill him. He grew stronger under her care, and eventually had intercourse with her. She gave birth to 10 sons, among whom was Assena who later became King of the Turks (Douglas, 1992).

Although an Islamic country, Turkey does not adhere to “Islamic Law” as practiced elsewhere (L’Etalon Doux, 1996). In Turkey, some people regard bestiality as sinful only when it involves animals that are edible, such as cattle or sheep. Turks also believe that sex with a donkey makes the human penis grow larger (Gregersen, 1983). Today in Turkey, although enforcement of moral laws is very strict, pony, donkey, and dog sex shows are known to run from time to time. The last reported arrests for bestial activity were in 1993 and took place near the Kurdish refugee camps. Turkey is also supposed to have some “camel and Eastern dances” sex shows, where local and other Arabian girls are employed (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

According to Dubois-Desaulle (1933), bestiality is still popular in Egypt. There are stories about a human-animal sex circus in Cairo, as late as the early 1960s (Rosenberger, 1969), and it is reported that brothels in Cairo provide sex shows of women and mule stallions (Hirschfeld, 1948; Ullerstam, 1966). In modern times, Egyptian shepherd boys are well known for engaging in sexual relations with animals in their herd. Egyptians especially favor fellatio, and rub honey or candy on the penis to encourage the suckling of lambs and goats (Bagley, 1968; Edwardes, 1959; Masters, 1962).

Braun (1967) mentions the notorious side-shows in Aden, Port-Said, Cairo, and Alexandria that offer tourists sex exhibitions in which animals play an important part. According to *The Wild Animal Revue* (1994/95), despite rising fundamentalism in North Africa and Arabia, dog, snake, and pony sex shows do exist there. In Lebanon, Beirut was known as a “hot place” for bestiality in the 1960s (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95), and according to Dubois-Desaulle, in 1933 bestiality was still very popular in Syria. Dekkers (1994) further reports that Algerians boys still have sex with she-asses because marital dowries are so high they cannot afford to get married and have sex with their wives.

In Africa, sexual acts between humans and animals were not punished or even considered socially unacceptable among the Kusai and Masai tribes (inhabitants of Kenya and Tanzania). On the South Sea Island of Kusai, men are reported to use cattle occasionally as sexual objects (Dekkers, 1994; Ford & Beach, 1951).

Masai male adolescents frequently use female donkeys as a sexual outlet (Dekkers, 1994; Ford & Beach, 1951; L'Etalon Doux, 1996), and as practice, since they believe it improves their lovemaking (Sparks, 1977).

The Suaheli (Bantu people of Zanzibar/Tanzania) and Arabian fisherman along the coast of Africa, near Mombasa, Kenya, until a hundred years ago, believed that unless they had anal sex with the sea-cows they netted, they would be dragged out to sea the next day and drowned by the dead sea-cow's sister. Many people would therefore make the fishermen swear, by the Koran, that they did not have sex with the sea-cow they were selling at the local market (Bledsoe, 1965; Love, 1992). Sparks (1977) believes this custom continues.

Other authors have reported that sodomy in the form of sexual intercourse with nanny-goats has been observed in Zanzibar/Tanzania (Bagley, 1968; Bloch, 1933; Masters, 1962). Female apes were reportedly seducing travelers by displaying and fondling their sexual organs, and male apes have been known to rape women in the Near East (Ramsis, 1969). At El Yemen, trained baboons were popular sex partners for both men and women, and the women in Abyssinia (Ethiopia) and the Sudan used to smuggle dog-faced apes (girds) into the harem and have sexual relations with them (Bagley, 1968; Edwardes, 1959; Masters, 1962). It is also said that the Ethiopians had a dog King for over a decade, whose "wife" was one of the native girls (Waine, 1968).

Among the Manghabei of Madagascar, bestiality with calves and cows has been observed to be practiced openly by children and adults alike (Bagley, 1968, Masters, 1962). It is further reported that tribal women in Africa, in the absence of male hunters, found the Basenji dog quite sexually proficient (Waine, 1968). The people of the Hottentot tribe, nomadic people in south-west Africa, do not consider bestiality to be immoral; they do, however, regard incest in the same negative light as Western people (Rosenberger, 1968).

Many tribes in Central Africa still believe animals to be the ancestors of human beings (Rosenberger, 1968). In Voodoo ceremonies, as well as some other religious and magical rituals, individuals believe themselves as transformed into animals, and have sexual relations either with other humans or with animals of the kind they believe themselves to be (Masters, 1962). Formerly, animal contacts were a part of the Ibo (Nigerian tribe) male coming of age ritual. Every boy had to copulate "successfully" with a specially selected sheep, to the satisfaction of a circle of elders who witnessed the performance. Among the Yoruba (another tribe in Nigeria), there was the custom that a young hunter had to copulate with the first antelope he ever killed, while it was still warm (Gregersen, 1983).

The Wild Animal Revue (1994/95) reveals that in the Sub-Saharan Africa, around cities and tourist areas, there are sex shows and an occasional sex circus with a wide variety of animals. Most shows use dog, pony, an occasional zebra, or wild ass with local girls.

South and Central America

The Inca civilization extended down the Pacific coast from Columbia to Chile and inland to the Andes. In their sexual mores, anal intercourse and bestiality were punishable by hanging. Included within the Inca empire were the Chimu, who had taken over an earlier Mochica civilization. Much of the pottery which had been collected by the Larco family, on whose property some of the first finds were found, and which are preserved in the Rafael Larco Herrera Museum in Peru, dates from before 1000 A.D. and represents the Mochica people (or Moche). The pots are decorated with what nowadays can be classified as erotic subjects. Six percent of these archaeological specimens depict bestiality of both men and women with various animals (Bullough, 1976; Dekkers, 1994; Tannahill, 1992), against only three percent of homosexuality themes (L'Etalon Doux, 1996).

In South America, several groups have made use of the llama or related alpaca for sexual outlets (Gregersen, 1983). There was also an ancient law in Peru, forbidding bachelors from having female alpacas in their homes (Mantegazza, 1932), because of the many reported cases of bestiality (Kullinger, 1969; Maybury, 1968), as well as forbidding men who were unaccompanied by women from herding llamas (Menninger, 1951). According to some, people in Peru believe that syphilis is a special disease of the alpaca, which is transmitted to man by this animal through sexual relations (Bagley, 1968; Mantegazza, 1932; Masters, 1962).

In South and Central America, bestiality was so prevalent when the Spaniards arrived, that the priests included the sin of bestiality in their confessional protocol (Dekkers, 1994; Rosenberger, 1968). In South

America, cow-copulation by men is not only common among certain Indian tribes, but also in the cities and towns of various countries. Several Indian tribes in Central and South America still believe that animals are the ancestors of human beings (Rosenberger, 1968).

Sexual contacts with animals are said to play an important part in the sex life of almost everyone in the Kagaba, an agricultural society in northern Columbia (Gregersen, 1983). There is an ancient pre-Columbian belief among Indians of the Caribbean coast of Columbia, that adolescent males will not achieve competence in marriage unless they practice intercourse with donkeys (Money, 1986).

In his doctoral dissertation, Penyak (1993) attempted to understand the diverse social norms that existed in central Mexico from 1750 to 1850, by examining written and verbal expressions of sexuality, including bestiality. Although bestiality was considered a much more serious offense than masturbation, not one of the 33 men accused of bestiality during this period was put to death. Sentences usually ranged from three to 10 years of imprisonment, depending on the amount of time the accused had already spent in jail, and could include anything from forced military service and hard labor on public projects to prayers. The animals, however, were routinely destroyed (Penyak, 1993).

Those charged with bestiality tended to be young, single males. The average age of the accused, out of an available sample of 16, was 13.75 years. Seventy percent were single, 24 percent married, and six percent were widowers. Indians, who comprised the highest percentage of people living in rural areas at that time, were more likely to be accused of this crime. In 27 cases, 41 percent involved female asses, 26 percent mares, 19 percent female dogs, 11 percent female mules, and four percent were female goats. Sexual deprivation and lack of other sexual outlets were common excuses used by the men to explain why they had satisfied their sexual appetites with animals (Penyak, 1993).

In an analysis of Latin American (Mexican, Cuban) pornography of the 1930s through the 1950s, Di-Lauro and Rabkin (1976) found that bestiality was a common theme. Films such as *Rin Tin Tin Mexicano, A Hunter and His Dog, Rascal Rex*, and *El Perro Masajista* all depict bestiality acts. *The Wild Animal Revue* (1991b) further describes a series of 8mm stag films, which appeared during the early 1930s, known as the "Mexican Dog" series. Issue number 11 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1994/95) describes Brazilian donkey films.

Issue 10 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1994) describes a live animal sex show in Mexico, as related by a reader who attended the Intelligence School at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, in 1980, and did a few "cross border" raids. Issue 11 (1994/95) describes a live sex show in Juarez, Mexico, in 1958, as reported by a reader, who was selling Bibles to the GIs at Fort Bliss, and happened to see a "horse show." The animal sex shows in Mexico have declined since the days of the 1950s and 1960s. There are still rumors, however, of the famous donkey shows (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

Dumont (1970) discusses "sexual resorts" in Brazil and in Mexico, to which wealthy women travel to enjoy their bestial interests without interference (Dumont, 1970). In Balboa, Panama, there used to be night clubs that featured a donkey having intercourse with a woman (Bryant, 1982). Dog, pony, and barnyard sex shows, involving local girls, still exist in Central America, and live sex shows are becoming more prevalent in Panama, due to the rise in drug use and the desire for tourist dollars. Local girls are mostly used. There has always been an underground trade in animal videos and magazines, and United States Customs occasionally checks tapes coming in from Panama (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

In Cuba, before the days of Castro, sex shows with animals were common in brothels, but Castro closed down all the brothels (Dekkers, 1994; Rosenfeld, 1967). There are currently no reports of animal sex shows in Cuba, and all the animal films that were shown before Castro's time, in little porn theaters, have disappeared (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

Brazil is especially known for its sex shows, and some of the latest animal porn films are from this country. Rio has shows in a section of the city which is not safe for foreigners. Costa Rica, Belize, and Guatemala all have underground shows. There are some dog and pony sex shows in the Caribbean, usually on the poorer islands, using local girls. There are no reports of animal sex shows in Haiti, since almost all animals have been eaten for food (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

In an ethnographic doctoral dissertation on the gaucho population living on the border of Brazil and Uruguay, Leal (1989) provides an analysis of the gauchos' life style, which includes bestiality. The gauchos are

horsemen and ranch workers. Most of the gauchos live segregated from women on the ranches where they work. They form a very specific masculine culture, which glorifies such values as honor, freedom, righteousness, and bravery. The gauchos understand bestiality as a legitimate practice within a group where the dominant cultural belief consists of mastering the wild. A sexual relationship with certain animals is not only a sanctioned practice within this group, but is seen throughout south Brazil as a herdsman's or rural tradition. "Barranquear" is the regional term used to refer to male sexual relationship with animals, usually mares (Leal, 1989).

For the gauchos, sexual relations with animals is a common practice of male sexual initiation in this pastoral region, although it is not restricted to rural areas. In the towns and cities of this region, bestiality is just another form of sexual play among male teenagers. It is tolerated by society as part of growing up and as a necessary erotic experience. Bestiality within this more urban context is practiced with hens, ewes, sows, cows, mules, and mares, but not with cats nor dogs. It is considered funny and an indication of manliness to engage in such sexual initiations. A group of boys will hold the animal while one of them has intercourse with it (Leal, 1989).

There is a sort of hierarchy of animals to be followed in the "barranqueamento." The sequence starts with the chicken and culminates with the mare. Chickens are for small and young boys. Although this hierarchy is desired in the sequence of sexual achievement toward manhood, contradictorily it is also the subject of ridicule. To have intercourse with a chicken means that the boy was unable to have it with anything or anyone else (Leal, 1989).

In the state of Rio Grande do Sul, there is an annual gaucho music festival, called the "Festival da Barranca." Barranca means bestiality. It is the only festival of this type to which women are not admitted, and the only one that is secret. No one knows where or exactly when it will happen. The festival lasts four days, and about 100 to 150 men participate in it. The male secrecy implies publicly that bestiality is practiced in this festival (Leal, 1989).

Leal (1989) relates that the majority of adult males from pastoral regions, including urban areas, have experienced bestiality at least once in their lifetime. Most gauchos do not engage in this practice as a regular activity. Nevertheless it is an important part of their customs. Yet, a few among them have "affairs" with animals, usually a mare, and usually with the same animal on a regular basis. For the gauchos, bestiality also shows courage, and the wilder the animal in the animal hierarchy, the more prestigious is the act. Leal (1989) further suggests that symbolically, by penetrating the mare, the man has a stallion's penis.

Leal (1989) points out that in Brazil, there is no legislation against bestiality, either under criminal or civil law. It is an offense only when it is done in a public area. The author further relates a proverb from Brazil that says: "Not every woman is a cow, but every cow is a woman" (Leal, 1989, p. 248).

Native Americans, Canadians and Eskimos

Among native Americans, bestiality varied from tribe to tribe, yet, female bestiality seems to have been very rare among American Indians (Rosenberger, 1968). Deutsch (1948, in Donofrio, 1996) reports that from a 13 year study done in the 1930's and 1940's with 550 Navaho Indians (in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah), it was found that married men occasionally engaged in bestiality while out herding alone. Unmarried girls engaged in bestiality as well.

According to Gregersen (1983), bestiality is said to have been unknown among the Chiriguano (the author probably meant the Chiricahua — native Americans who live in Oklahoma and in New Mexico), but common among the Crow (native Americans who live in the upper basins of the Yellowstone and Bighorn rivers, in eastern Montana) who had no scruples about having sexual relations with mares and wild animals that had just been killed in the hunt. Although all forms of animal sexual contacts are taboo among the Ojibwa (native Americans and Canadians who live in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Ontario), Ojibwa women make use of dogs, while Ojibwa men have sexual relations with dogs, bears, moose, beavers, caribou, and porcupines (Gregersen, 1983). Cases of bestiality among the Mohave (native Americans who live along the Colorado river in Arizona and California) are known to have involved mares, female asses, heifers, sows, and hens (Menninger, 1951).

Bestiality is fairly common among the Hopi Indians in north Arizona (Dekkers, 1994; Ford & Beach, 1951), who regard sex with animals unemotionally, with neither guilt nor affection. Bestiality is not considered socially unacceptable (L'Etalon Doux, 1996), and Hopi men are reported to have intercourse with burros, dogs, horses, sheep, and chickens (Ford & Beach, 1951). Hopi boys are sometimes directed to animal contacts so that they will leave girls alone (Gregersen, 1983; Rosenberger, 1968). The Sioux (native Americans of the Great Plains) and the Apache (native Americans in south-west U.S. and in north Mexico) had similar views. The Plains Indians (a number of native north American tribes that inhabited the Great Plains, and followed the buffalo) were known to experiment with colts and to use freshly slain animals for sexual purposes (Rosenberger, 1968).

In the Canadian Indian tribe of the Salteaux, sexual relations between women and dogs are reported. It is also reported that hunters have sex with moose and with female bears they have shot, before the animals get cold (Menninger, 1951).

Sexual acts between humans and animals were not punished or even considered socially unacceptable among the Kupfer Eskimos (L'Etalon Doux, 1996). Among the Copper Eskimo, intercourse between men and live or dead animals is not infrequent and is not prohibited (Ford & Beach, 1951).

The New World — The American Colonies

Some sexologists and historians believe that bestiality was more common in Colonial America than it is now. This is primarily because farming was the main occupation in all the colonies (Rosenberger, 1968). There is a theory that the widespread plague of syphilis which swept through Europe in the 16th century was started by sailors who returned from the New World, after having had sexual intercourse with girls who lived there. These girls acquired the disease from the local cow-boys who had sexual relations with their cattle (Greenwood, 1963).

Colonial laws against bestiality required harsh punishment, since the colonists believed that these relationships could have reproductive consequences of monstrous offspring. Therefore, the colonists made sure that the person as well as the animal was executed (D'Emilio & Freedman, 1988). Although executions were rare, D'Emilio and Freedman (1988) point out that sexual experimentation with animals was as widespread in colonial America as in other agricultural societies.

D'Emilio and Freedman (1988) relate that the crime of sodomy, in colonial America, was not equivalent to the contemporary concept of homosexuality. Sodomy was perceived as any “unnatural,” non-procreative sexual relations between two men, a man and an animal (technically considered buggery or bestiality), or even between a man and a woman. Dekkers (1994) adds that in colonial times, intercourse with blacks was a worse kind of bestiality for a white person than with a cow or a pig.

In Plymouth Colony, a divorce law enacted in 1639 mentions bestiality specifically as a reason for divorce (L'Etalon Doux, 1996). The Pilgrim colony also prescribed death for the person engaging in bestiality, and destruction of the animal. The colony of Pennsylvania ordered life imprisonment and whipping of the person involved in bestiality, at the discretion of the court. The “buggery” law of the Rhode Island colony referred to the English common law of 5 Eliz. 17 as justification for the death penalty for human-animal sexual contact (Bruno, 1984). Katz, in his book *Gay American History* (in Bruno, 1984), quotes post-colonial Virginia law which prescribed castration as a remedy for bestiality.

The first recorded instance of bestiality in the New World took place in 1642 in a village near Plymouth Colony. Thomas Granger, a 16 or 17-year-old servant confessed and was found guilty of having sexual contact with a mare, a cow, two goats, five sheep, two calves, and a turkey. The court ordered a lineup of sheep so that the boy could identify his sexual partners. All the animals involved were slaughtered and burned in front of him, and the boy was executed on September 8, 1642 (Bullough in Matthews, 1994; D'Emilio & Freedman, 1988). According to Dekkers (1994), also in 1642, eighteen year old William Hackett, was sentenced to death in colonial Massachusetts for inserting his penis into a cow.

Connecticut Colony “Capital Laws” stated that any man or woman who had sexual relations with a beast, “or brute creature by carnal copulation,” would be put to death, and the animal slain and buried (Bruno,

1984, p. 194). On June 6, 1662 (Dekkers believes it was in 1642), at New Haven, Connecticut, a 60-year-old man named Potter, was executed for engaging in bestiality. He had been a member of the Church for 20 years, and was noted for his devotion in worshiping and praying, and for his zealousness in reforming the sins of other people. Yet, he had engaged in bestiality for approximately 50 years. Before Potter was executed, his cow, two heifers, three sheep, and two sows were killed before his eyes (Bagley, 1968; Evans, 1987).

The United States of America

According to Chideckel (1938), the practice of bestiality is more common in Europe, Asia, and in Latin countries than in the United States. Masters (1962) and Kinsey *et al.* (1948) relate that bestiality is more prevalent in western America than in other places in the United States, and Ramsis (1969) reports that in America, bestiality cases (people who were caught) have been most frequent in the South, and most often involved blacks. Others say that in American society, bestiality is found most frequently among adolescent males, who grow up on farms (Ford & Beach, 1951; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948), and according to Bloch (1933), in Hawaii, the prevalent promiscuity produces universal homosexuality, sodomy, and bestiality.

In 1848 and in 1884, there were reports of births in the United States of creatures with dogs' heads (Masters, 1966). In 1892, a sexual performance between a prostitute and a Newfoundland dog was witnessed in San Francisco. The woman afterward declared that once a woman copulated with a dog, she would no longer desire a man (Davis, 1954).

In the Los Angeles area, there used to be a club in the 1960s, of "sophisticated sexualists" who met once a month and held orgies, where sex with animals was reportedly part of the party (Bagley, 1968). Bryant (1982) relates that in recent years, there have been reports of individuals involved in the swinging circles arranging animal-human sexual contacts for the stimulation and sexual gratification of themselves and others in the group. Waive (1968) reveals that the business of party dog training (training dogs for sexual performances with humans) is one of the best kept secrets of our modern society, yet it flourishes in every major city in the United States.

According to Dumont (1970), there used to be a guest ranch in Texas, as late as 1970, which arranged sexual relations between the guests and various horses trained for performing sexual acts. Dumont (1970) interviewed a wealthy woman, from New York, who was one of the founders of the "super sexualists" organization, whose members include a select number of successful women, very active in the art world. This organization centers on the sexual use of snakes and other reptiles.

The Pet Book series from Greenleaf Classics in San Diego, California, has flourished since the early 1970s. The Pet Books are explicit, and intend to excite the erotic fantasies of men and women who enjoy fantasizing about sexual relations with animals (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991). Bagley (1968) reports on a sex show with animals in a town near Atlanta, Georgia. A full length, underground movie was also reportedly shown in some San Francisco adult movie theaters a few years ago. The film was called *Animal Lovers* and portrayed the female star engaging in intercourse with various types of animals including a dog, a donkey, and a pig (Bryant, 1982). There are also the Color Climax' 8mm animal films, such as *Dog Fuckers*, *Horse Lovers*, and *Horsepower*, all from 1970. Another two 8mm stag films appeared in the early 1970s in which porn star, Linda Lovelace, had sex with a large dog. Lovelace, however, has denied her participation in such films (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991). In recent years, the Broadway theater has been increasingly open in its portrayal of the full spectrum of sexual themes and activities. One such production, *Futz*, depicted the theme of bestiality (Bryant, 1982).

In 1962, Illinois became the first American state to revise its criminal code along the lines suggested in The Model Penal Code, devised by the American Law Institute. Specifically, oral-genital contacts, and anal intercourse between consenting adults in private, and sexual acts with animals were no longer considered criminal offenses. Connecticut, New York and Kansas have also made some revisions in this area (L'Etalon Doux, 1996).

In 1986, twenty-six states and the District of Columbia prohibited bestiality — in some cases stated specifically and in others under "crimes against nature" (Donofrio, 1996). Bruno, a fellow graduate of the Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality, researched bestiality laws in the United States for me. He

found out that as of 1997, twenty-five states and the District of Columbia outlawed bestiality. The sentences range from a mere fine of not more than \$500 in Tennessee to an indeterminate life sentence in Michigan. This means, he says, that 25 states, the District of Columbia, and the United States Government have no laws governing mere acts. Every state and federal entity have, however, laws prohibiting depictions or performances by minors of any sexual conduct with bestiality specifically listed as among the taboos. He further comments that it seems remarkable that in this day and age such a variation as to criminal penalty should exist within the same country. The following depicts his findings, summarizing state statutory laws which make “mere” acts of bestiality criminal:

1. Arkansas Statute 5-14-122, Sodomy

“(a) A person commits sodomy if such person performs any act of sexual gratification involving: (1) The penetration, however slight, of the anus or mouth of an animal or a person by the penis... of an animal; or (2) The penetration, however slight, of the vagina or anus of an animal.” “(b) Sodomy is a class A misdemeanor” which carries a sentence that shall not exceed one year.

2. California Penal Code 286.5, Bestiality-Punishment

“Any person who sexually assaults any animal... for the purpose of arousing or gratifying the sexual desire of the person is guilty of a misdemeanor” which carries imprisonment for not more than 6 months in county jail and/or by fine not more than \$1,000.

3. Delaware Statute Title 11 777, Bestiality

“A person is guilty of bestiality when the person intentionally engages in any sexual act involving sexual contact, penetration or intercourse with the genitalia of an animal or intentionally causes another person to engage in any such sexual act with an animal for purposes of sexual gratification. Bestiality is a class D felony” which carries incarceration punishment up to eight years.

4. Georgia Statute 16-6-6, Bestiality

“(a) A person commits the offense of bestiality when he performs or submits to any sexual act with an animal involving the sex organs of the one and the mouth, anus, penis, or vagina of the other.” “(b) A person convicted of the offense of bestiality shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than one nor more than five years.”

5. Idaho Code 18-6605, Crime Against Nature-Punishment

“Every person who is guilty of the infamous crime against nature, committed... with any animal, is punishable by imprisonment... not less than five years.”

6. Kansas Statute 21-3505, Criminal Sodomy

“(a) Criminal sodomy is:... (1) Sodomy between... a person and an animal;... or (3) causing a child 14 or more years of age but less than 16 years of age to engage in sodomy with any... animal... (c) Criminal sodomy as provided in subsection (a)(1) is a class B nonperson misdemeanor (which carries the punishment of not more than six months imprisonment and/or a fine of up to \$1,000)... and (a)(3) is a severity level 3, person felony” which carries the punishment imprisonment from 46 months to 206 months.

7. Louisiana Revised Statute 89, Crime against nature

“A Crime against nature is:... (1) The unnatural carnal copulation by a human being... with an animal... Whoever violates the provisions of this Section shall be fined not more than two thousand dollars, or imprisoned, with or without hard labor, for not more than five years, or both.”

8. Maryland Code Article 27 553, Sodomy generally

“Every person convicted of the crime of sodomy shall be sentenced to the penitentiary for not more than ten years.”

Maryland Code Article 27 554, Unnatural or perverted sexual practices

“Every person who is convicted of taking into his or her mouth the sexual organ of any... animal, or who shall be convicted of placing his or her sex organ in the mouth of any animal, or who shall be convicted of committing any other unnatural or perverted sexual practice with any... animal, shall be fined not more than one thousand dollars... imprisoned... for a period not exceeding ten years, or... both.”

9. Massachusetts Statute 272 34, Crime against nature

“Whoever commits the abominable and detestable crime against nature... with a beast, shall be punished by imprisonment... for not more than twenty years.”

10. Michigan Penal Code 750.158, Crime against nature or sodomy; penalty

“Any person who shall commit the abominable and detestable crime against nature... with any animal shall be guilty of a felony, punishable by imprisonment... not more than 15 years or if such person was at the time of said offense a sexually delinquent person... may be punished by imprisonment... for an indeterminate term, the minimum of which shall be 1 day and the maximum of which shall be life.”

11. Minnesota Statute 609.294, Bestiality

“Whoever carnally knows a dead body or animal or bird is guilty of bestiality, which is a misdemeanor (and carries a punishment of imprisonment of not more than 90 days and/or fine not more than \$700.00). If knowingly done in the presence of another person may be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than one year or... fine of not more than \$3,000.00, or both.”

12. Mississippi Code 97-29-59, Unnatural intercourse

“Every person who shall be convicted of the detestable and abominable crime against nature committed... with a beast, shall be punished by imprisonment... for a term not more than ten years.”

13. Montana Code 45-5-505, Deviate sexual conduct

“(1) A person who knowingly engages in deviate sexual relations or who causes another to engage in deviate sexual relations commits the offense of deviate sexual conduct. (2) A person convicted of the offense of deviate sexual conduct shall be imprisoned... for any term not to exceed 10 years or fined for an amount not to exceed \$50,000.00, or both.”

Montana Code 45-2-101 (20)

“Deviate sexual relations means sexual contact... or any form of sexual intercourse with an animal.”

14. Nebraska Revised Statutes 28-1010, Indecency with an animal; penalty

“A person commits indecency with an animal when such person subjects an animal to sexual penetration as defined in subdivision (6) of section 28-318. Indecency with an animal is a Class III misdemeanor” which carries a maximum three months imprisonment and/or maximum fine of \$500. N.R.S. 28-318 (6) states “Sexual penetration means sexual intercourse in its ordinary meaning, cunnilingus, fellatio, anal intercourse, or any intrusion, however slight, of any part of the actor’s or victim’s body or any object manipulated by the actor into the genital or anal openings of the victim’s body which can be reasonably construed as being for non-medical or non-health purposes.”

15. New York Penal Code 130.20, Sexual misconduct

“A person is guilty of sexual misconduct when:... 3. He engages in sexual conduct with an animal... Sexual misconduct is a class A misdemeanor” which carries an imprisonment sentence that shall not exceed one year.

16. North Carolina Statute 14-177, Crime against nature

“If any person shall commit the crime against nature, with... beast, he shall be punished as a class I felon” which carries a range of imprisonment from three to 10 months.

17. North Dakota Statute 12.1-20-12, Deviate sexual act

“A person who performs a deviate sexual act with the intent to arouse or gratify his sexual desire is guilty of a class A misdemeanor” which carries a maximum of a one year imprisonment and/or a maximum fine of \$1,000. N.D.S. 12.1-20-02 states “‘Deviate sexual act’ means any form of sexual contact with an animal, bird...”

18. Oklahoma Statute Title 21 886, Crime against nature

“Every person who is guilty of the detestable and abominable crime against nature, committed... with a beast, is punishable by imprisonment... not exceeding ten (10) years.”

19. Rhode Island Statute 11-10-1, Abominable and detestable crime against nature

“Every person who shall be convicted of the abominable and detestable crime against nature... with any beast, shall be imprisoned not exceeding twenty (20) years nor less than seven (7) years.”

20. South Carolina Statute 16-15-120, Buggery

“Whoever shall commit the abominable crime of buggery, whether with mankind or with beast, shall, on conviction, be guilty of felony and shall be imprisoned... for five years or shall pay a fine of not less than five hundred dollars or both...”

21. Tennessee Statute 39-13-511, Public indecency

“(a)(1)(A) A person commits the offense of public indecency who, in a public place... knowingly or intentionally:... (i) Engages in... bestiality... (3) Public indecency is punishable as follows: (A) A first or second offense is a Class B misdemeanor punishable only by a fine of... \$500.00... (B) A third or subsequent offense is a Class A misdemeanor punishable by a fine of... \$1,500.00 or confinement for not more than eleven (11) months and twenty-nine (29) days or both.”

22. Texas Penal Code 21.07, Public Lewdness

“(a) A person commits an offense if he knowingly engages in any of the following acts in a public place or, if not in a public place, he is reckless about whether another is present who will be offended or alarmed by his:... (4) act involving contact between the person’s mouth or genitals and the anus or genitals of an animal or fowl... (B) An offense under this section is a Class A misdemeanor” which is punishable by a fine not to exceed \$4,000 or confinement for not more than one year, or both.

23. Utah Statute 76-9-301.8, Bestiality – Definitions – Penalty

“(1) A person commits the crime of bestiality if the actor engages in any sexual activity with an animal with the intent of sexual gratification of the actor... (2) For the purposes of this section only: (a) “animal” means any live, non-human vertebrate creature, including fowl; and (b) “sexual activity” means physical sexual contact:... (i) between the actor and the animal involving the genitals of the actor or the animal and the mouth or anus of the actor or the animal; (ii) through the actor’s use of an object in contact with the genitals or anus of the animals. (3) A crime of bestiality is a class B misdemeanor” which is punishable by imprisonment not exceeding six months.

24. Virginia Statute 18.2-361, Crimes against nature

“If any person carnally knows in any manner any brute animal,... or voluntarily submits to such carnal knowledge, he or she shall be guilty of a Class 6 felony” which is punishable by imprisonment of not less than one year nor more than five years, or not more than 12 months and a fine of not more than \$2,500, either or both.

25. Wisconsin Statute 944.17, Sexual gratification

“(2) Whoever does any of the following is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor (which is punishable by a fine not to exceed \$10,000 and or imprisonment not to exceed nine months):... (c) Commits an act of sexual gratification involving his or her sex organ and the sex organ, mouth or anus of an animal. (D) Commits an act of sexual gratification involving his or her sex organ, mouth or anus and the sexual organ of an animal.”

(More on bestiality laws in the Epilogue.)

According to Stayton (1994), sodomy laws in the United States still reflect an intolerant attitude toward non-procreative sexual behavior. The laws do not differentiate most of the time between single or married, heterosexual or homosexual, men or women (Stayton, 1994). For example, heterosexual oral sex is illegal in Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Georgia, North and South Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Virginia, and in the District of Columbia. Men whose erections show through their clothes face the law in Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington DC, and Wisconsin (Shook & Meyer, 1995 in Marie Claire, 1996). Nevertheless, since in the United States bestiality is lumped together with homosexuality as “sodomy,” the prosecution of the former has declined with that of the latter (Dekkers, 1994).

Issue number 5 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1992) discusses the Advent Partners, Ltd, which is a 20-year-old organization with 8,000 members world wide. The organization was founded by Dr. B., a psychiatrist specializing in family and sexual dysfunction counseling. He and his wife developed a sixty day treatment program for couples who experience lack of sexual desire and pleasure. During this treatment program, couples were exposed to and experimented with various sexual techniques, including sex with animals. Around 1992, Advent Partners solicited letters from its membership regarding their experiences with animal sex. Out of 3809 responses, 536 have had direct and complete sexual encounters with animals as a regular part of their sex lives. The other 3273 have used this type of sex as a form of sexual fantasy, and said that they are open to trying it. The article further points out that a major university is conducting a study of the Advent Partners membership, regarding their use of the sexual techniques developed by Dr. B. and his wife. I tried sending a letter to Dr. B., but received no answer. The editor of *The Wild Animal Revue* later told me that he lost contact with the Advent Partners, Ltd, and that he does not know whether this story is true.

Regarding sex shows: there are reports of underground private local animal shows in the United States and Canada, but nothing organized. At one mid-Western high school, the football team still gets a “goat show” after “home coming,” reportedly, a tradition for over 20 years (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95). There were also reports about some wild animal sex shows during construction of the Alaskan pipe line. Some years ago, a girl from New Orleans put on dog shows at private clubs around the country. She got \$1500 for a performance (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1994/95).

In January of 1992, Mark Matthews, the author of *The Horseman* (1994), founded the Zoophilic Outreach Organization (ZOO). ZOO offers non-professional peer-group advice and mutual support (Matthews, 1994; Stasya, 1996).

The Internet

The Internet has been an ideal medium through which the zoos could “come out;” it allows anonymity as well as the intimacy of a diary (Montclair, 1997). Within the Internet, there are several electronic bulletin board systems dedicated to the subject of zoophilia. Through such services, one can make contact with his/her personal computer and find other people who share similar experiences and feelings (Matthews, 1994). Today, if you search the Internet for “bestiality,” “zoophilia,” and other related key-words, you may find thousands of sites devoted to these topics.

Alt.sex.bestiality (A.S.B.) was one such Internet’s news group which started around 1990 as someone’s idea of a joke. Six years later, with the great influx of people on the Internet, A.S.B. grew and matured into a discussion and support group (Andriette, 1996; Fox, 1994; Montclair, 1997). For a while (until

its bulletin board became over-crowded with sex ads) A.S.B. served as a meeting place and discussion forum for people who were interested in emotional and sexual relationships with animals (Fox, 1994). A.S.B. included information about health issues, laws governing this activity, bibliographic references, "how to" guides, written, and pictorial erotica, and information about the zoo community events (Donofrio, 1996). Most people in this newsgroup have had sexual relations with animals, and many were quite proud of it. There were also many others who have not had any sexual contact with animals, but who were eager to do so (Fox, 1994). For most zoos, finding other zoos has changed their lives. It has given them a new self understanding, and connected them with like-minded friends (Andriette, 1996). A newer newsgroup is alt.sex.zoophile which allows zoos to discuss ways to get the most pleasure during sex with their animals, as well as post personals-type ads (Kim & Bailey, 1997).

Stasya's Web Page about zoophilia was initiated in September of 1995. It has averaged a "hit" (a visitor) every three minutes on the opening page alone. At the beginning of February 1996, the page stabilized at 10,000 or more accesses a month on the opening page (Montclair, 1997; Stasya, 1996). Stasya reports that he receives anywhere from two to six messages per day from people saying "thank you for being there" (Stasya, 1996).

One can also find other resources for zoos on the ever-changing world of the World Wide Web, such as: CalZoo Home Page — the web page for the Northern California Zoophile Community, The Ultimate Zoo Page, Mikcat's Zoo Page, and k9rott's Home Page. There are also "talkers" or "MUDs" (Multi-User Dungeons or chat rooms) which allow a user to talk with others in real time. One such "talker" is the Forest, which is a long-lived closed talker. To receive an account one must first communicate by e-mail to the owner. Another talker is Lintilla, which is based in Sweden, and has made a commitment to allow its zoophile users to design their own home. It has an open door policy, and new users can get an account by simply logging on (Stasya, 1996). Other chat rooms were Jungle Fever and Plane of Animals (Actaeon & Hobbes, 1996-1997)

Another chat room popular with people interested in zoophilia is FurryMUCK (or Furry), which involves an online role playing game based on a computer in Canada. On Furry, all characters are animals; some have human-like features (anthropomorphic), and others do not. Such characters are often referred to as "Furries." A person who logs on to Furry gets to play a character. The role-play is not about sex, and the majority of players are not zoophiles, but it is obvious that this game attracts many zoophiles and bestialists (Fox, 1994). Actaeon and Hobbes (1996-1997) add that most zoos are attracted to animal-based cartoon characters, especially when they are drawn in a "sensual way."

CHAPTER 3

THEORIES AND OPINIONS

As mentioned before, various authors have theorized about different issues concerning bestiality/zoophilia. Yet, the views differ and vary greatly. The following reviews what different authors have said about the mental health status of zoophiles and bestialists, why people engage in sexual relations with animals, the frequency of bestiality, the issue of animals' consent, animals' cross-breeding, and bestiality and the arts.

Bestiality/Zoophilia from a Mental Health Point of View

In the first edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM), published by the American Psychiatric Association (APA, 1952), "Sexual Deviations" was listed together with "Antisocial Reaction" and "Dissocial Reaction" under the heading "Sociopathic Personality Disturbance." In the second edition of the DSM (APA, 1968), "Sexual Deviations," along with "Personality Disorders," "Alcoholism," and "Drug Dependence" were still grouped under the category of "Personality Disorders and Certain Other Non-Psychotic Mental Disorders." "Sexual Deviations" was listed, however, as a separate division with 10 subdivisions, from "homosexuality" (302.00) to "Other Sexual Deviations" and "Unspecified Sexual Deviations" (302.90). "Zoophilia" was not listed in DSM-II.

In the third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (APA, 1980), "Sexual Deviations" was replaced by the term "Paraphilia," and was included in the new category — "Psychosexual Disorders." "Paraphilia" is a collective medical term for "abnormal sex," under which sexual relations with animals usually falls (Money, 1986). According to Money (1986), the word "paraphilia" is made of two Greek words: "Philia" which means "love," and "Para" which means "what precedes it," or "altered" (Money & Pranzarone, 1993). Together those two words mean "the love that goes beyond what is ordinarily expected" (Money, 1986). "Paraphilia" is a condition occurring in men and women characterized by a compulsive responsiveness to and dependency on an unusual and personally or socially unacceptable stimulus for optimal initiation and maintenance of sexual arousal and the attainment of orgasm (Dewaraja & Money, 1986; Money & Pranzarone, 1993). Money (1986) points out that to be considered a "paraphilia," zoophilia should exclude sexual contact with human partners, or the person should prefer an animal contact over a human one. In legal terminology, a "paraphilia" is a perversion or deviancy, and in the everyday language it is considered kinky or bizarre sex (Dewaraja & Money, 1986).

In the DSM-III (APA, 1980), "zoophilia" is listed for the first time, as a paraphilia, and is categorized as mental disorder number 302.10. Under the diagnostic criteria for zoophilia is the following description: "The act or fantasy of engaging in sexual activity with animals is a repeatedly preferred or exclusive method of achieving sexual excitement" (APA, 1980, p. 270). The *Manual* suggests that usually the preferred animal is one with which the individual had contact during childhood. The authors have no information about the age of onset for this paraphilia. However, they state that initially in the course of the disorder, there may be sexual arousal by humans. As time progresses, the animal becomes the most powerful sexual stimulus. This usually occurs by early adulthood and the disorder then becomes chronic.

In the revised, third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-III-R, APA, 1987), "zoophilia" is no longer categorized as a disorder by itself. The diagnostic committee that worked on the paraphilia section of the DSM-III-R concluded that "zoophilia is virtually never a clinically significant problem by itself" (APA, 1987, p. 405). They omitted it as a formal diagnosis and listed "zoophilia" in the diagnostic label of "Paraphilia Not Otherwise Specified" (302.90). This category serves paraphilias that do not meet the criteria for any of the specific categories listed in that edition. "Zoophilia" is listed there together with "Telephone Scatologia," "Necrophilia," "Coprophilia," and other paraphilias. The current (fourth) edition of the *Manual* (DSM-IV, APA, 1994), treats "zoophilia" in the same manner.

Many believe that people who have sexual relations with animals are mentally disturbed in one way or another. For example, Dubois-Desaulle (1933) believes that among human beings, sexual love for an animal is almost always a symptom of mental disease: "It is an anomaly springing from social pathology, from teratology, from morbid psychology" (p. 120). Ellis (in Masters, 1962 & in Masters, 1966) believed that the "offense" is usually committed by people who are abnormal, or suffer from anxiety neurosis, and Allen (1979) suggests that bestialists are mentally defective. According to Blake (1971) "bestiality is abnormal and a 'sickness' from a mental health point of view" (p. 23). He also suggests that most of the common sexual deviations are a "product of... a severe personality defect" (Blake, 1971, p. 109). In cases of bestiality, Christy (1967) and Shenken (1964) state, a mental disorder of one form or another is usually present. Alvarez and Freinhar (1991) suggest that a sexual interest in animals constitutes an important attribute of psychiatric patients. Others further suggest that there is significant incidence of bestiality among schizophrenics and individuals with schizoid personalities (people who experience great anxiety in human relationships) (Clancy, *et al.*, 1978, in Alvarez & Freinhar, 1991; Sword, 1978). Treatment, thus, suggests Sword (1978), should include looking for a possible underlying schizophrenic process, toward which therapy should be primarily focused.

According to some authors, zoophilia/bestiality is often associated with other sexual disorders (Braun, 1967; Cerrone, 1991; Dekkers, 1994; Dumont, 1970; Karpman, 1962; Rosenberger, 1968; Rosenfeld, 1967). Rosenberger (1968) points out that bestiality is sometimes associated with exhibitionism, and Karpman (1962) and Rosenberger (1968) add that it is very closely affiliated with sado-masochism. Braun (1967) suggests that there is a close connection between masochism and bestiality. This is commonly evident in the female who allows an animal to excite or satisfy her sexually (Braun, 1967). Bestiality is also associated with fetishism (Dekkers, 1994), and Money (1986) relates that a paraphiliac fetish may indeed be a live creature.

According to Krafft-Ebing (1935), fetishism, as an explanation of zooerasty, has utterly failed. Krafft-Ebing adds that "if it be in reality a fetishistic manifestation, this possibility cannot be based upon the present knowledge of fetishism" (p. 566). At present, he relates, zoophilia is regarded as an original perversion, which should be placed on the same level with "antipathic sexuality." On page 570, however, the author relates that "the present state of our knowledge does not permit of a final judgment as to whether zooerasty is an original anomaly or a perverse condition acquired through fetishistic influences."

Cerrone (1991) points out that there is no support for any type of causal relationship between zoophilia and associated paraphilias. Yet, the author calls for programs training psychologists who practice in rural areas, to consider including the assessment and treatment of zoophilia as part of their abnormal psychology curriculum. Cerrone further suggests treatment that consists of family therapy, social assertiveness training, and sex education. The latter is provided to reduce the clients' "misperceived thoughts of sex and to educate them to the norms of sexual development" (p. 37). According to Cerrone, this multi component approach to the treatment of zoophilia has been proven effective (Cerrone, 1991).

Davis (1954) relates that bestiality is distinguished from other sexual perversions since other perversions easily adapt themselves to society, while bestiality does not. He explains that this is so because bestiality appeals to a different mentality than other perversions. Those who practice bestiality "are the most backward and coarse of all perverts... it is the vice resorted to by those who are not capable of surviving in our sexual society, those who cannot interest females because of their lack of personality... Bestiality as a rule flourishes among the more backward and primitive peoples of the world" (Davis, 1954, p. 25).

The following is what Krafft-Ebing (1935) prescribed a 47 year-old man who came to see him for advice about his sexual relations with animals: "I made strong suggestions to be on his guard against masturbation and bestiality, and to seek more the society of ladies; prescribed anaphrodisiacs, advised frugality, slight hydrotherapy, plenty of open-air exercise, (and) steady occupation" (p. 569).

McNally and Lukach (1994) treated a 33 year old, white, mildly "mentally retarded" man who compulsively masturbated in front of large dogs, and often persuaded them to lick his penis after he had ejaculated. The patient's sexual fantasies had exclusively involved exhibitionistic activity in front of dogs. The authors offered this patient a six-month behavioral treatment program comprised of masturbatory satiation, covert sensitization, and stimulus control procedures. The authors report that at termination, the patient no longer became sexually aroused by dogs, and his masturbation fantasies entirely concerned sexual activity with women.

Ratliff (1976) suggests that when the rural pastor discovers a case of true and chronic bestiality, he should seek a psychiatric referral. If such referral is not possible, “a strongly affirmative pastoral relationship, designed to support and if possible build up the ego or self-image of the afflicted male, is the treatment of choice” (p. 22). The pastor should maintain a concerned relationship with that individual for however long a period of time may be required “for the young man to identify his essential heterosexual inclinations, and begin to positively express them” (p. 22).

Marshall (1972) relates that often strong feelings of guilt are experienced by the bestialist, and are accompanied by psychosomatic manifestations that develop in later years (Marshall, 1972). Arbagian, in his Foreword to Ellison’s book (1970), relates that more often than not the bestialist is aware that his behavior is wrong and unnatural. He/she feels ashamed, and carries this secret with him/her all his/her life. This burden often provokes numerous secondary unwanted feelings. London and Caprio (1950) and Caprio (1963) suggest that the feelings of guilt associated with this behavior are capable of producing severe states of anxiety. Part of therapy, therefore, should consist of relieving the client’s anxiety by assuring him that such activities occur in a high percentage of the farm population. The authors add that many individuals who had sexual relations with animals during childhood and adolescence ultimately make “a satisfactory heterosexual adjustment” and are then regarded by society as “normal” (Caprio, 1963, p. 277; London & Caprio, 1950, p. 589).

In a book that presents case studies of people who engage in sexual relations with animals, Ramsis (1969) relates that the people he talks about in his book are all mentally sick. In the book, he suggests therapy approaches to treat “this problem,” among which are intensive therapy at a mental hospital and shock therapy. Ramsis (1969) points out that bestialists are currently treated as mentally ill people rather than criminals, and that this trend is a healthy one. Bagley (1969) further suggests that “talking out” one’s impulses to have sexual relations with animals will prevent similar events from occurring.

Havelock Ellis (in Rosenberger, 1968), believes that all bestialists are perverted. In Davis (1954), Ellis states that bestiality and zoerastia are a more perverted form of erotic zoophilia. The main difference is that they occur either in more insensitive or in more markedly degenerated personalities. Blake (1972) states that people who engage in bestiality are “in the category of psychotic perverts” (p. 299).

Matthews (1994) reports that there are some zoos who feel that their “true spirits” are animal, and that their human bodies are therefore inappropriate. The author suggests that these people are somewhat similar to transsexuals who feel that their genitals do not match their gender identity. He relates that some people have coined the term “specie dysphoria” to describe this particular situation.

Others make a distinction between bestiality and zoophilia. According to Krafft-Ebing (1935), “violation of animals” is not always due to psychopathological conditions: “Low morality and great sexual desire, with lack of opportunity for natural indulgence, are the principal motives of this unnatural means of sexual satisfaction” (p. 561). However, he points out, there is another group of bestialists who are of a pathological nature, since these individuals exhibit “impotence for the normal act,” and are impulsive when performing the “unnatural act” (Krafft-Ebing, 1935, p. 563).

Rosenberger (1968) states that every bestialist who prefers sexual relations with an animal over a human partner is considered a moral pervert with a true pathologic sexual perversion. On the other hand, those who have sex with animals because they do not have access to “normal” sex, are not considered perverts. Karpman (1962) adds that if the behavior becomes fixated, and the person develops continuing sexual attraction toward animals, “there is, of course, a definite paraphilia involved” (Karpman, 1962, p. 358).

Hunt (1974) explains that for humans, the instinctual control that animals have is replaced by the conditioning of a long child-rearing and socializing process. During early childhood, the human being is thoroughly imprinted and taught to choose other human beings as love objects and, eventually, as sex objects. The choosing of a nonhuman creature as a love and sex object is therefore regarded as psychologically abnormal. Hunt believes that most human-animal sexual encounters are isolated or rare experiences of a primarily experimental nature, and are largely confined to the early stages of life. Most of these experiences, therefore, “are sociologically deviant but psychologically normal... True pathological bestiality consists of repeated animal contacts during the late teens and adult years, (while) the normal processes of interpersonal growth should have made such sexual activities unnecessary, unrewarding and psychologically repellent” (Hunt, 1974, pp. 358-359).

Haeberle (1978) reports that it is unreasonable to attach psychiatric labels such as “zoophilia” and “bestiality” to isolated sexual contacts with animals. He believes that only those individuals who always prefer animals to human partners can be considered “sexually maladjusted,” and those rare cases can be assisted with professional help. Masters (1966) has a similar point of view. According to Masters, sexual acts with animals that are a result of a lack of opportunity for heterosexual intercourse, and are not due to preference or incapacity, are not the products of a perversion. On the other hand, bestiality may be a part of neurosis and self-damaging behavior when it is more significant for the person. In such cases, bestial behaviors may be harmful since they produce strong feelings of guilt, with possible detection and subsequent punishment. However, the author points out, only rarely is the animal contact a product of sexual perversion, where the person’s desires are primarily or exclusively directed toward animals (Masters, 1966).

Masters (1962) defines those whose sexual desires are exclusively or preferentially directed toward animals rather than toward humans of the opposite gender as perverted/sick people. He points out, however, that there is only a small minority of these perverted individuals. The author adds that human-animal sexual contacts may be regarded as perverted only in cases where the animal is excessively “humanized,” and is a symbol and a personalized substitute for a human love-object.

According to Karpman (1962), zoophilia or bestiality resembles masturbation, and is a paraphilia only when it involves the deliberate use of animals as sexual objects. The author considers masturbation a paraphilia except when practiced by the average youth or adult “in reaction to temporary sexual privation” (Karpman, 1962, p. 606). According to Money (1986), paraphilias, in general, are disorders of pair-bonding, thus disorders of falling in love. It is actually, he points out, inaccurate to call them sexual disorders since they are disorders of love, not lust.

There are those who carry Money’s belief a step further, and suggest that bestiality and zoophilia are not mental/sexual disorders at all, and should not be cured. Kurrelgyre (1995) relates that most people possess a mental picture of the typical person who has sexual contact with animals: a poor, naive, confused, desperate, uneducated, ignorant farm boy. This is rarely (if ever) the case. Zoos are not warped, twisted people; they are just ordinary people with an extraordinary desire (Kurrelgyre, 1995). Fox (1994) adds that zoophiles and bestialists are not mentally ill or developmentally retarded in any greater frequency than anyone else in the general population. Having an interest in animals as sexual partners does not preclude one from keeping an interest in humans. In fact, Fox points out that quite a few people in the alt.sex.bestiality news group, on the Internet, have human partners and are quite happy in their heterosexual or homosexual relationships (Fox, 1994). Zoophilia, according to Kurrelgyre (1995), is not a disease that should be “cured.” It is simply a relatively rare and harmless psychological condition. Most zoos, he adds, would not want to be “cured.” Matthews (1994) relates that zoos are all functional members of society. They are people like anyone else, except in their sexual behavior.

Matthews (1994), the author of *The Horseman*, believes that zoophiles are not “normal” by most accepted definitions, but that they are human beings. As such, rather than casting them out, imprisoning them, or confining them to treatment, he suggests that it is perhaps time for society to take a closer look at its attitudes toward people who have had sexual relations with animals. He says: “As long as we don’t harm or hurt any people or our partners, as long as we are still productive, functional members of society, why, then, the opprobrium? Why not let us be? Is society harmed by diversity or enriched? Please think about it” (p. 208).

A few authors agree with Matthews’ point of view, and feel that as long as the animal is not hurt or mistreated, there is no need for social interference (Dekkers, 1994; Haeberle, 1978; Masters, 1966; Masters *et al.*, 1988). Ullerstam (1966) relates that there are no biological or medical grounds whatsoever for devaluation of sexual relations between human beings and animals. Historically, the judgment against this form of sexual behavior originated among a pre-scientific people, out of fear and superstition (Ullerstam, 1966). Greenland (1983) adds: “In terms of actual harm to society, bestiality is surely the least offensive of sex crimes” (Greenland, 1983, p. 325).

Masters (1962) suggests that the condition of zoophilia, where there is a genuine feeling for the animal on the part of the human, calls for psychiatric, or better psychoanalytic intervention unless the individual is happy with it and otherwise well-adjusted. In this case “it would be better if society rose to the challenge posed by nature’s wealth of variations from the norm and just let them alone, not attempting to interfere with an equilibrium which can in no way result in injury to anyone else” (p. 65). Zooerasts (bestialists), too, need be of

no concern to society, since in most cases they are “no more ill than any other masturbator, and will switch to a human sex partner whenever an appropriate one becomes available to them” (Masters, 1962, p. 66).

In his book, Akeret (1995), a psychotherapist, discusses five of his most memorable clients, one of whom, in 1965, was in love with a polar bear. At that time, according to the DSM, homosexuality was a perversion as much as zoophilia. The author points out that curing his client from zoophilia appeared no easier than trying to cure a homosexual. Akeret further reports that, more than 30 years ago, he believed deep in his “unorthodox” heart, that if he had discovered a way for his client to live with the polar bear happily and safely, he would have helped him seek it.

Other psychotherapists have noted that sexual attachments to animals are likely to escape detection as psychopathological manifestations unless carried to extreme degrees (Chee, 1974, in Alvarez & Freinhar, 1991; Menninger, 1951; Storr, 1964). Dixon and Dixon (1996) complain about the difficulty of studying the issue of bestiality: They have been trying to study the topic of bestiality for years, but have not been able to solicit enough people who admitted to engaging in bestiality to conduct a scientific study of any significance. Rosenfeld (1967) too, relates that bestialists do not tend to talk about their intimate sexual contacts with animals.

On the other hand, elsewhere in the same book, Rosenfeld (1967) points to a trait bestialists have in common — their willingness to discuss their sexual contacts with animals with other people, once they know they can trust the person to whom they are talking and know that he/she will not condemn or judge them. Trimble (1969) agrees with that view and suggests that his subjects’ expressing themselves so freely is an indication that they welcomed the opportunity to “confess.” Their confessions, he says, are actually a form of therapy whether they realize it or not. Ramsis (1969) emphasizes that the most prominent abnormal trait zoos exhibit is verbosity. They delve into elaborate description of the most insignificant detail, explaining what happened and what they were thinking and feeling. The author points out that this is their way of communicating to others what is troubling them, and to seek help. Bagley (1968) further relates that once communication barriers are broken down, zoos welcome the opportunity to ventilate and discuss their bestial experiences. However, it takes a great deal of probing by professionals before zoos admit to the exact bestial behaviors and sexual feelings achieved by having sex with an animal (Bagley, 1968).

In summary, most authors see people who engage in sexual behaviors with animals as mentally sick individuals who have many other social and/or intellectual problems. Others make a distinction between bestiality and zoophilia. They perceive the former as a non-issue, like masturbation, and the latter as a mental disorder. Then there are those who believe neither bestiality or zoophilia is a problem that needs to be cured, as long as the individual engaging in sexual relations with animals does no harm to the animals, is satisfied with his/her life, and is a functional member of society.

Why do People Engage in Sexual Relations with Animals?

In reviewing the literature about bestiality and zoophilia, there are abundant and broad theories and explanations for the question of “why” do people have sexual relations with animals.

Freud (1963), in the *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* (originally published in 1905) translated by Brill, explains the sexual attraction to the “sexually immature” (children and animals) as substitution for the “proper object,” when the latter cannot be secured. Others have agreed with Freud, and perceive the practice of bestiality as a substitute or a supplemental type of sexual outlet, as is masturbation, when a partner is unavailable (Allen, 1979; Alvarez & Freinhar, 1991; Bledsoe, 1965; Christy, 1967; Cornog & Perper, 1994; Dekkers, 1994; Dumont, 1970; Holmes, 1991; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948; Masters, 1966; Masters *et al.*, 1988; Moll, 1897, in Trimble, 1969; Ramsis, 1969; Russell, 1971; Steirmann, 1966; Stoller, 1975; Trimble, 1969; Waive, 1968; Villeneuve, 1973, in Dekker, 1994).

Kinsey *et al.* (1948) further suggest that rural communities are more traditional and religious, and tend to condemn pre-marital sexual relations. Farm boys, therefore, may often be forbidden to associate with girls (Kinsey *et al.*, 1948). Bestiality is practiced most frequently in regions where people suffer from sexual deprivation as a result of religious and social restrictions (Allen, 1979; Bledsoe, 1964; Krafft-Ebing, 1935; Masters, 1962; Stekel, 1952; Ullerstam, 1966). According to Bagley (1969), there are people whose normal sex

channels are closed off as a result of strict teachings or an early sexual experience for which they were punished and/or humiliated. In these individuals, thoughts about a “proper” sex partner are not possible. Sexual urges become strong, and “create an unbearable conflict at the near-conscious level” (p. 33). These urges propel them, without their awareness, into homosexual relations, bestial relations, and other sexual areas which are condemned by society (Bagley, 1969).

Other authors relate that in most cases, the animal serves as a substitute for the absent human love object (i.e. a deserted child who misses his/her mother may turn to an animal for love). For a lonely person, it substitutes for the missing or otherwise unavailable companion or sexual partner (Hirschfeld in Niemoeller, 1946b; Hunt, 1974; Masters, 1962; Rappaport, 1968). According to Menninger (1951), “totemism” is an ambivalent attachment to certain animals and sometimes to objects with considerable conscious elements of various emotions, such as love, fear, and avoidance. These feelings stem from an unconscious displacement from a human object toward whom they cannot be expressed. Totems represent the secret retention of a forbidden loved or hated object in a substituted form. It is as if a boy sexually aroused by his mother or sister, and forbidden by circumstances and prohibitions from gratifying his sexual urges, displaces his fantasies to animals of his childhood life. Few, Menninger relates, become aware of the fact that the animal represents another close person, such as a mother or a father.

Similarly, cruelty to animals may stem from anger toward human figures toward whom such behavior could not be exhibited (Menninger, 1951). In zooerasty, the animal not only serves as a substitute for a human object, but “it is also abused for the re-enactment of traumatic experiences under pressure of the principle of repetition compulsion. The animal then becomes an outlet for sadistic-murderous impulses” (Rappaport, 1968, pp. 583-584).

Menninger (1951) further proposes that sexual relations with animals that persists in adult life, suggests an inconclusiveness or unsatisfactoriness in reality, thus the need of a deviant love object. Ramsis (1969) proposes that most people who engage in bestiality share a common theme of sexual unhappiness. Often unpleasant initial sexual experiences motivated these people to seek pleasure with animals. Once they become sexually involved with an animal, their pursuits become an obsession. Allen (1979) theorizes that people who engage in this behavior are immature since they, like children, show a great deal of affection to animals. Allen (1979) further believes that sexual relations with animals frequently occur under the influence of alcohol.

According to Menninger (1951), the root of this perversion is in the Oedipus complex. Allen (1979) further hypothesizes that “There is no doubt that the animal is used as a maternal substitute and to avoid the Oedipus situation which a woman would evoke. No doubt, also, there is often a considerable amount of castration in bestiality, since by the avoidance of a woman the ‘bestiosexual pervert’ is symbolically, or by his behavior, enacting a castration situation” (Allen, 1979, p. 259). Sword (1978) too, believes that in adulthood, bestiality represents reaction against castration anxiety. Stone (1992) believes that denial of the fact of castration leads to the fantasy of bestiality, which constitutes a “fetish of near-perversion.” Alvarez and Freinhar (1991) explain bestiality as reenactment of primal scenes, “vested sadism,” reaction against castration anxiety, and heterosexual substitution.

Moll (in Chideckel, 1938 & in Krafft-Ebing, 1935) believes that bestiality is an arrest of undifferentiated sexuality, which means that the individual does not differentiate between humans and animals as partners for his/her sexual needs, and derives the same sexual gratification from an animal as from a human. Krafft-Ebing (in Chideckel, 1938) adds that even the power to differentiate between male and female animals as an object for sexual gratification is lacking for these people.

According to Greenwood (1963) and Somers (1966), bestiality is somewhat like many cases of homosexuality, since it often occurs when normal sexual outlets are not available. Blake (1971) states that bestiality is a deviation or perversion of the human sexual instinct. He equates bestiality to homosexuality and relates: “I cannot buy the argument that the practice (of homosexuality) is normal in adulthood just because females are not available. I sincerely believe that masturbation accompanied by heterosexual fantasies are more of a normal outlet than homosexual acts” (Blake, 1971, p. 13). Rappaport (1968) adds that bestiality not only serves to divert the acting out of homosexual impulses, but also of violent sadistic impulses from human objects. “Anyway, it usually is sadism which is predominant in the homosexual perversion” (Rappaport, 1968, p. 585). Blake (1971) explains that homosexual men are more inclined to have sexual relations with animals

because they are more aggressive, and they have more trouble finding a satisfactory human sex partner than heterosexual males.

Dekkers (1994) points out that many boys have a homosexual preference for animals, and Andriette (1996) adds that it is estimated that about a third of the zoos on the Internet also identify themselves as gay people. Trimble (1969) goes further to say that “selfishness, fear of the opposite sex, strong erotic drive, quest for variety, fear of deep love involvement, all are common to a great extent to both homosexuals and bestialists” (Trimble, 1969, p. 57). Krafft-Ebing (1935) remarks that the zoerast, as compared with the sexual invert (homosexual), “is much farther removed from the normal object. This would qualify the perversion of the former as a much graver condition — because more degenerative — than that of the latter” (Krafft-Ebing, 1935, p. 571).

Trimble (1969), finds the development of bestiality similar to those of both homosexuality and pedophilia, since these all are forms of sexual perversion. He states that bestiality, like homosexuality, is a state of mind — a sexual preference. Kolb and Brodie (1982, in Cerrone, 1991) point out the similarities between zoophilia and pedophilia. They believe that these paraphilias are generated by heterosexual fearfulness and extreme self-doubt. Consequently, the zoophile or pedophile seeks sexual gratification in animals or children, respectively. Morse (1963, in Trimble, 1969) compares some bestialists to necrophiliacs; in bestiality, the author relates, as in necrophilia there is no fear of rejection, embarrassment, or failure.

Although Somers (1966) believes that bestiality is not a neurotic perversion, Ellison (1970) proposes that overt bestiality arises out of a neurosis of a sexual nature. This sexual neurosis may first be expressed in behaviors such as homosexuality, sado-masochism, child molestation, masturbation, exhibitionism, promiscuity, etc.. Somewhere in its course, the expression of sexual neurosis becomes focused upon sexual contact with animals. This may happen out of curiosity, experimentation, accidental opportunity, or out of a deliberate wish to be more “sinful,” as in the case of a masochist (Ellison, 1970).

Others believe that bestiality usually involves curiosity (Dekkers, 1994; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948; Marshall, 1972; Masters *et al.*, 1988), experimentation (Dumont, 1970; Hunt, 1974; Karpman, 1962; Marshall, 1972), and masochism (Blake, 1972; Stekel, 1952; Trimble, 1969). As opposed to masochism, a desire to exercise control may be another reason for engaging in sexual relations with animals according to Blake (1971), Cerrone (1991), Christy (1967), and Stanway (1991, in Donofrio, 1996).

In a paper describing zoophilia in two males, ages 15 and 10 years old, Cerrone (1991) describes them as feeling helpless and angry toward their parents’ constant arguing. Failure to verbalize their anger toward their parents, coupled with the thought of abandonment, were important factors in their progressive emotional and social withdrawal. The boys developed a chronic depression in which they doubted their importance in any interpersonal relationship. Their self-doubt was magnified further as they entered the awkwardness of adolescence. Since the boys had animals on their farms, they developed an anthropomorphic relationship with them, and projected their anger and affection onto them. Their sexual relations with the animals became their physiological and psychological release of repressed anger. The dominance over the animals also contributed to a sense of control to an otherwise “out-of-control” home situation.

Nagaraja (1983), Rosenfeld (1967) and Waine (1968) believe that people become bestialists through a chain of unfortunate circumstances, often during childhood. The majority of bestialists are victims of their backgrounds. Ramsis (1969) suggests that the home is the root of the problem, since most of his case studies come from homes where love was lacking, sex was repressed, and often one or both parents were suffering from sexual problems themselves. Somers (1966), however, does not believe that bestiality is caused by any childhood trauma.

Some authors suggest the possibility that a first accidental sexual experience at an early age with an animal may fixate an individual’s sexual interest at the level of bestiality (Donofrio, 1996; Matthews, 1994; Trimble, 1969; Rosenberger, 1968; Stekel, 1952). The condition is thus established before an opportunity for normal sexual relations occurs. Even though the experience may be brief, and heterosexual relations may be established later on, the fixation can still be a weighty problem in adult life (Trimble, 1969).

Money (1986) and Dekkers (1994) suggest that paraphilias may be the result of imprinting, which is a learning process that occurs during and depends on a critical period. (A critical period is a specific time period

in which the individual is susceptible to specific changes). Money and Pranzarone (1993) introduce the concept of a Lovemap, which is a developmental representation in the mind and brain, depicting the idealized lover, and the idealized program of sexual and erotic activity with that lover. Once a lovemap has formed, it is extremely resistant to change (Money & Pranzarone, 1993). According to this explanation, once a bestiality lovemap is formed through imprinting, which may have been the result of accidental sexual experience during a critical period, the person will forever have bestial inclinations.

Kinsey *et al.* (1948) follow the “learning theory” and propose that the boy who has regular sexual contacts with animals becomes conditioned to respond sexually to the animals. Although for most males, animal contacts are replaced by sexual relations with human females as soon as they are available, some become psychologically attached to the animal(s). They may achieve erections and orgasms rapidly with animals, may begin to dream and fantasize about sex with animals, may develop an affectional relationship with a particular animal, and may experience grief and mourn at the loss of the animal. Rachman and Hodgson (1968, in Cerrone, 1991) suggest a behavioral model to explain the dynamics of zoophilia: They propose that the zoophile’s behavior is continually reinforced by the orgasm experienced as a result of sexual relations with the animal. They further maintain that the strength and frequency of the individual’s sexual desire for animals are increased when other sexual outlets are not available.

Some authors suggest that animal relationships provide a source of unconditional love (Arbagian, in Ellison, 1970; Dekkers, 1994; Donofrio, 1996; Ramsis, 1969; Sword, 1978; Waine, 1968). Arbagian, in his Foreword to Ellison’s book (1970), states that a primary cause of bestiality is the individual’s defense mechanism against fear of rejection or humiliation from the opposite gender. Christy (1967) relates that relationships with lower animals often accompany inferiority complexes and other personality disorders. Bestiality may be preferred by people too anxious to have sexual relations with another human being for various reasons, such as having a small penis, or fear of commitment or pregnancy (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Krafft-Ebing, 1935; Masters, 1962; Masters, 1966; Trimble, 1969; Villeneuve, 1973, in Dekker, 1994).

Isolation (Blake, 1971; Cerrone, 1991; Christy, 1967; Ratliff, 1976), loneliness, and a need for companionship (Blake, 1971; Christy, 1967) are often countered through sexual contact with animals and pets. Stekel (1952) adds that friendless people are inclined to seek the companionship of pets. Thus, he says, it is no wonder that among people who have engaged in sexual contact with animals, we find many lonely, unmarried people.

The individual’s constant proximity and familiarity with animals (Allen, 1979; Bledsoe, 1965; Bloch, 1933; Cerrone, 1991; Davis, 1954; Ellis in Masters, 1966, in Masters, 1962 & in Niemoeller, 1946b; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948; Ronsenfeld, 1967), and the sight of their sexual activity (Bloch, 1933; Love, 1992; Nagaraja, 1983), are other contributing factors in bestiality.

Some authors believe that bestiality is a perversion of primitive people, of dumb/morons (Ellis, in Masters, 1962 & in Masters, 1966; Rosenfeld, 1967), and insensitive people (Rosenfeld, 1967), while others believe that bestialists are characterized by low morality (Cornog & Perper, 1994; Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Dumont, 1970; Krafft-Ebing, 1935). Cauldwell (1948 & 1968) asserts that lack of sex education and information are also factors in bestiality, and Bledsoe (1964) adds the feeling that there is something inherently dirty about sex as a possible factor.

The belief that bestiality may be practiced because people believe that copulating with animals cures venereal disease and/or makes the penis grow, is shared by Ellis (in Masters, 1962 & in Masters, 1966) and by Masters (1966). Dubois-Desaulle’s translator (A. F. N., 1933) and Niemoeller (1946b) (this may be the same person) believe that the belief in the curative powers of bestiality when it comes to venereal diseases, is one of its major causes. This belief can be found among almost all uncultured peoples who have ready access to animals. Others relate that some individuals may engage in bestiality out of fear of contracting sexually transmitted diseases from humans (Bagley, 1968; Dekkers, 1994; Villeneuve, 1973, in Dekker, 1994).

Attraction to bestiality also comes from the fact that it is unknown and forbidden (Ramsis, 1969). A desire for novelty and variation (Dekkers, 1994; Hirschfeld in Niemoeller, 1946b; Masters *et al.*, 1988; Stekel, 1952) are further popular motivational factors of bestiality. Dumont (1970) and Handy (1977) suggest that the basic reason for people to engage in bestiality is boredom. Davis (1954) proposes that when it comes to married

people, like most extra-marital intercourse, bestiality generally develops from sexual dis-satisfaction with the spouse.

Moreover, animals cannot talk, thus cannot accuse the individual of forcing them to have sex with him/her against their will (Ramsis, 1969; Sword, 1978), and cannot tell about the sexual encounter to anyone and ruin the individuals's reputation (Blake, 1971; Trimble, 1969; Waine, 1968). Blake (1971) also suggests motivational factors, mostly for females, such as a wish to stay a virgin or not to "sleep around."

Another common belief is that those who indulge in bestiality are often people whose sexual needs are greater than those of the average man or woman (Cornog & Perper, 1994; Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Dumont, 1970; Krafft-Ebing, 1935; Masters, 1962; Moll, 1897 in Trimble, 1969; Ramsis, 1969; Rosenfeld, 1967; Trimble, 1969). Gebhard *et al.* (1965), in their study on sex offenders, suggest that animal contact is correlated with high frequencies of self masturbation and with an early onset of puberty, which are characteristics of the homosexual offenders as well as the heterosexual aggressors (see the chapter on Studies Concerning Bestiality and Zoophilia).

Kinsey and his associates (1948) suggest that sometimes a boy is attempting to replace the male animal in sexual relations as an outcome of an identification with the animal. The boy may masturbate a male animal and derive much erotic excitement when seeing the genital similarities between the male animal and himself. This excitement may be enhanced by the fact that the male animal achieves orgasm. Kinsey *et al.* (1948) therefore conclude that for these reasons farm boys have as much sexual contact with male animals as they do with female animals. Moreover, they relate that most boys do not consider this behavior to be homosexual, and are in no conflict over it. Often, the boy is inspired by knowledge of similar activity among other boys. Somers (1966), disagrees and states that men do not identify with male animals.

Specifically about sexual relations of women with dogs, Waine (1968) suggests the following motivations: dogs may be better lovers than men — they last longer, their tongues are larger and rougher, and they love to perform oral sex. Handy (1977) terms this as "The Failure of The Human Male Syndrome" (men who are not as good lovers as the animals are). Waine (1968) goes further to say that sex with dogs is different, hence exciting; it is fun, it feels good, dogs are affordable and the males are always ready for sex, they do not talk back, nag, or complain, and sometimes, the human partner likes to watch. The latter is termed by Handy (1977) as "The Amusement of the Husband Syndrome" (men who enjoy watching their woman partner involved in sex acts with animals).

When it comes to horses and women, Bagley (1968) suggests that to many women, the horse symbolizes passion and strength. According to the author, there is a psychic attraction between women and horses, and in some cases, this psychic attraction becomes so great that it is expressed on a physical level. When this happens, the woman engages in bestiality not because she is a perverted individual, but because she needs to release her psychic pressures.

According to Bledsoe (1964), women who engage in bestiality are generally those who cannot get a man, or feel there is something inherently dirty about sex. Chideckel (1938) states that there is no doubt that a woman who has sexual relations with animals is abnormal, since "any woman, virtuous or lewd, can always find a man for sexual congress may she be ever so ugly. There is always a gentleman in town who is at all times willing to accommodate, even though married" (Chideckel, 1938, p. 316).

Fox (1994) believes that sexual relations with animals is as valid a sexual preference as homosexuality is. Cauldwell (1948 & 1968) relates that bestiality is a result of an inherent passion, and Donofrio (1996) reports that the concept of zoophilia being a sexual orientation was supported by his doctoral study. He, therefore, suggests using a scale resembling Kinsey's sexual orientation scale, which was also offered by Blake (1971). Donofrio's model suggests that those who have no interest whatsoever in sexual contact with animals would appear at the Zero point of the scale. Those individuals whose sole sexual outlet and attraction are animals, would be assigned the Six position. Along that continuum, between these two extremes, would be individuals who include animal sexual contact in their fantasy, or have had incidental experiences with animals, have had more than incidental contact with animals, place their sexual activity with animals equal to that involving humans, prefer animal contact but engage in more than incidental contact with humans, and those who engage primarily in contact with animals with only incidental human sexual contact.

Dekkers (1994) suggests that the animals may simply be sexually arousing to the humans: Cows, female donkeys and mares are well equipped in their hips and buttock area when seen from behind. With a slight sway of the hips, presenting their large vulva at an inviting height, they can easily lead a man into temptation. Dekkers (1994) further believes that milking a cow can be an erotically charged activity.

Gebhard *et al.* (1965), however, relate that animal contact is most often engaged in without any psychological involvement. It is virtually impossible, they say, to find a male sexually interested in pictures of animals as opposed to pictures of human females or males. Another example of the little emotional significance of animal contact, the authors say, is that often a man who has had a homosexual experience in his youth may worry that he will turn into a homosexual, “but we have yet to interview a man who, because of animal contact in his youth, lives in dread that he will later find himself sexually interested only in animals” (Gebhard *et al.*, 1965, p. 657).

Some authors have articulated an interesting theory about the inner meaning of bestiality to the human being. According to Rosenberger (1968), the desire to have sexual relations with animals has always been with mankind. It lies within the id, buried deeply within the unconscious of most human beings. According to Ellison (1970), the human being is an animal which by evolutionary accident has become what he is today. The core of the beast within him is present under a layer of gray matter in the brain, which allocates much of its energy and function to repressing and denying that animal. In other words, man is an animal who denies his own animality. Nevertheless, man feels his animality, and projects it into his external world; into art, literature, and mythology. This is, according to Ellison, the real essence of the psycho-mythic meaning of bestiality (Ellison, 1970). Edenn (1971) adds that “not in spite of, but because of man’s greater intelligence, he has been driven by enormous compulsions to relate himself to his universe, to bring himself into a ‘oneness’ with his environment” (Edenn, 1971, p. 14).

In summary, theories about the reasons for bestiality vary greatly, as the different authors have different opinions about the topic. Despite all these theories, there is no scientific study available on the reasons to engage in sexual relations with animals. It appears, however, that there are multiple possible determinants for the etiology of sexual relations between humans and non-human animals.

Prevalence of Bestiality/Zoophilia

There are inconsistencies among authors with regard to their beliefs about the prevalence of bestiality/zoophilia. Some say it is a widely spread phenomenon (Blake, 1965; Dixon & Dixon, 1996; Rosenberger, 1968; Sparks, 1977; Steirmann, 1966; Stekel, 1952), while others (such as: Cauldwell, 1968; Cornog & Perper, 1994; Ellison, 1970; Hunt, 1974; Kaplan, 1989; Mandetta & Gustaveson, 1976; Masters, 1962; Ratliff, 1976; Stone, 1992), believe bestiality/zoophilia is rare.

Matthews (1994) relates that in his research, he discovered that there is a small but significant number of people in the United States who, for one reason or another, do prefer animals to humans when it comes to companionship and sex. Cornog and Perper (1994) point out that Kinsey and Hunt’s prevalent percentage translates into millions of individuals in the United States.

Money (1986) distinguishes between bestiality and zoophilia, and relates that zoophilia is fairly rare. Russell (1971) points out that bestiality is rare, but not as rare as most people would like to think, and Krafft-Ebing (1935) notes that real cases of zooerasty (zoophilia) are very rare. However, he also points out that this may be explained by the ease with which they are kept secret.

One of the difficulties in compiling any meaningful statistics on bestiality is public reluctance even to talk about the subject (Ramsis, 1969). No bestialist runs up and down the street shouting “I fuck animals!” No bestialist will admit it, unless maybe to a close friend or a psychotherapist (Rosenberger, 1968). Therefore, there are no statistics on the prevalence of “sensuous crotch contact” with pets, nor on more explicit contact of the sexual organs (Money, 1986).

Many authors believe that bestiality is more frequent in rural areas than in urban places (Bloch, 1933; Cerrone, 1991; Davis, 1954; Ford & Beach, 1951; Freud, 1963; Haeberle, 1978; Karpman, 1962; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948; Mandetta & Gustaveson, 1976; Marshall, 1972; Niemoeller, 1946b; Storr, 1964), while others relate that

the practice of sexual relations with animals is found more frequently in large cities (Ramsis, 1969; Rosenfeld, 1967).

Cerrone (1991), who believes that bestiality is frequently found in rural areas, explains: "Predisposing factors, such as the relative isolation of people, and the personality types of some individuals, may contribute to the higher than expected frequency of zoophilia in the rural population" (Cerrone, 1991, p. 29). Davis (1954) adds that although bestiality is very rare among married men, it is more common among husbands living in western rural areas.

Davis (1954) relates that bestiality is frequent in places where man is constantly the companion of animals. This activity is often engaged in by children of rural areas, who discontinue the practice as they grow older. However, Davis notes, individuals found to practice bestiality in adult life do not have a rural background!

Allen (1979) points out that it is evident that bestial fantasies are common, although probably rarely put into practice in urban life. Yet, according to Russell (1971), the use of large dogs as sexual partners is not uncommon in large cities among both homosexuals and heterosexuals.

Rosenfeld (1967) points out that there is evidence that sexual contacts with animals in the city are more frequent and involve a larger variety of acts than in rural areas. Rosenfeld (1967) and Blake (1972) further state that animal lovers in cities have more sexual desires and greater imaginations. Stekel (1952) relates that city dwellers who have little contact with animals are still frequently affected with zoophilia, and Greenwood (1963) explains that the only reason that city dwelling men have less sexual contact with animals is that they have fewer opportunities to do so than men who live and work on farms. Bryant (1982) concludes that bestiality and other sexual diversity and deviancy may be more characteristic of rural than of urban areas, but the belief is that, in fact, the city, not the country, is the "meeting place of flesh and the devil."

Bestiality is also an open secret in circuses, among the individuals who work with animals and among those who take care of them (Essen, 1969). Furthermore, bestiality is a common behavior in areas where the religion teaches that human beings are reincarnated as animals (Davis, 1954).

Most notorious in bestiality, in legend and in fact, are the shepherds, who often find themselves isolated and bored, and revert to the woolly little lambs they tend (Maybury, 1968). Moreover, it is common knowledge that among sheep herders and other men who spend long periods of time away from humans, bestiality is an understandable, if not an acceptable, practice (Bagley, 1968).

Most authors believe that zoophilia/bestiality is generally much more prevalent among males than among females (Chideckel, 1938; Cornog & Perper, 1994; Davis, 1954; Dekkers, 1994; Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Freud, in Blake, 1971; Hunt, 1974; Kinsey *et al.*, 1953; Mandetta & Gustaveson, 1976; Storr, 1964). Davis (1954) believes that this is probably due to the fact that it is more practical and convenient for a male to engage in bestiality than for a female. According to the author, a woman needs more privacy, and usually some sort of support such as a bed or a couch. Yet, the author admits that it is fairly easy for a woman to teach a dog to perform cunnilingus on her.

Kinsey *et al.* (1953) attempt to explain the low frequency of sexual contact with animals that women reported in their study. They propose that girls do not discuss sexual activities as freely or as frequently as boys do, they have less knowledge about sexual matters than boys do, and they less often observe sexual activity among other girls or among animals. If they do observe animal sexual activity, it usually does not produce sexual arousal for the girls.

Dekkers (1994) adds that in the countryside, girls have less opportunity than boys to have sexual relations with animals, since almost all animals are females. Where there are male animals on the loose, "girls are greatly alarmed by them" (Dekkers, 1994, p. 137). Friday (1974), however, believes that with barnyard studs, whether imagined or in actual life, women become sexually aroused by the visual stimulus of the incredible size of the animal's penis.

In the Hunt study (1974), 1.9 percent of the women had had sexual relations with animals, compared to the Kinsey *et al.*'s figure of 3.6 percent (for post-pubescent women). Hunt points out that although the farm population in the United States has shrunk since the Kinsey study, it is not easy to explain the decline in the

female incidence of bestiality, since Kinsey *et al.* found little difference in incidence between farm-reared and city-reared females. One possible explanation, Hunt (1974) proposes, is that Kinsey *et al.*'s female sample consisted of almost 60 percent of single women, while the Hunt's sample had only 25 percent of single women. Since most instances of sexual contact with animals in the Kinsey *et al.*'s sample occurred among single rather than married women, Hunt suggests that it might seem that this disproportion accounts for the drop in the overall incidence. Also, single females in the Kinsey *et al.*'s sample were generally far more inhibited concerning heterosexual contacts than those in the Hunt's sample. Hunt, therefore, suggests that the 1970's single woman is more likely than the single woman in Kinsey *et al.*'s study, to become involved in sexual relations and that they are far less likely to turn to "the awkward and unsatisfactory expedient of contact with animals" (Hunt, 1974, p. 356). The women in the Kinsey *et al.*'s sample, Hunt speculates, may have turned to experimental contact with animals in desperation.

Allen (1979) relates that some people have suggested that women practice sexual relations with large domestic hounds and other dogs. The author, however, emphasizes that if this is true, this must be very rare since he has never treated a case like that, nor seen one before the courts. Greenwood (1963) adds, that in reality, intercourse between women and animals is probably very rare, since "most women do not suffer from the physiological pressure of a sex drive sufficiently strong to force them into doing such potentially dangerous acts" (p. 139). Women could also risk being scratched or bitten by the male animal "whom they could not effectively control" (p. 139). Greenwood (1963) points out, however, that male dogs can be trained to perform with women. Yet, "it is doubtful that the average woman would be willing to devote the necessary time and effort to such a project when there are men so easily available" (p. 140). On the other hand, the author goes on, with only a minimum of training a dog can be taught to lick the woman's vulva, and since the dog is not involved sexually himself, there is no difficulty in controlling him. "The only major problem is the emotional state of the woman who requires such bizarre stimulation to satisfy her sexual desires" (Greenwood, 1963, p. 140).

Some authors believe that women have by no means left men to monopolize bestiality (A. F.N., in Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Greenwood, 1963; Krafft-Ebing, 1935; Mantegazza, 1932). Bagley (1968) suggests that more women take to dogs than do men. This is because women are less able to "sleep around" due to social constraints, and because it is safer. For a woman who does not have a sexual partner, it is better to satisfy herself with her dog than to run the risk of sexually transmitted diseases, pregnancy, and loss of reputation. Krafft-Ebing (1935) relates that the intercourse of women with animals is limited to dogs, and Somers (1966) and Christy (1967) believe that the dog appears to be the prime favorite of women who engage in sexual relations with animals, where the woman's vulva is manipulated by the dog's mouth. Moll (in Chideckel, 1938) reports that he knows of quite a number of women who kept dogs and trained them to practice cunnilingus, and Bloch (1933) concludes that the "lap dog" is by no means only the consoler of old maids; "it is to be found at least as frequently in the possession of married women" (Bloch, 1933, p. 185).

Trimble (1969) suggests that female bestiality is widespread. Friday (1981), based on her research about sexual fantasies states that in her opinion, women have more real sex with animals than can be statistically determined, and Rosenberger (1968) points out that in the cities, bestiality is believed to be more common in women than in men.

Blake (1971) also believes that female bestial acts are much more widespread than most people would realize, although they seldom come to the attention of authorities. He does not agree with Kinsey's findings which show that female bestiality is rare. In his opinion, in the childhood and adolescent years, there are indeed more males than females who experience sexual relations with animals. However, whereas the males outgrow it, the cities and farms both have many "sex-starved" females who continue or take up the practice of bestiality.

According to Russell (1971), many teenage girls go through a period of bestial relationships that serve as a method of masturbation. This is most common among females who ride horses. Most girls outgrow this method of masturbation when they start to have sexual relations with men.

Masters (1962) suggests that while male bestiality is primarily the province of the country-dweller, female bestiality is more likely to be the province of the city-dweller. Dumont (1970) states that bestiality is prevalent among women of the upper class, since they do not have to go to work, or worry about cooking and cleaning, and they have plenty of time to be bored.

According to Fox (1994), there are, indeed, more men than women in the alt.sex.bestiality newsgroup on the Internet. One reason for this is that the Internet and computers in general are still male dominated environments. Another reason is that women who post in alt.sex.bestiality have usually been recipients of “geeky” e-mail, asking them if they will be willing to let “Mr. Geek” watch while they have sex with their animals. It is therefore that women tend to keep quiet, and although some may read the postings on alt.sex.bestiality, they do not respond (Fox, 1994).

Animals' Consent

One topic that is often discussed on alt.sex.bestiality, on the Internet, is the question of cruelty to animals. In essence, the argument usually boils down to the issue of consent; animals cannot speak to give their consent to have sexual relations with a human being, thus it must be rape (Fox, 1994). Some authors believe that bestiality sometimes involves sadistic acts that may harm the animal (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Masters *et al.*, 1995; Masters *et al.*, 1988; The Humane Society, 1998). According to Dekkers (1994), when sadistic activities are practiced, bestiality is occasionally involved because an animal is an easier victim than a human being. Dekkers further relates that, generally, in sexual relations with a human, the animal is most often a victim. The animal sometimes even pays for it with its life, such as in the case with chickens and rabbits. Intercourse with chickens automatically involves sadism. Force is also often required to get the animal to do what the human being wants.

The Humane Society (1998), in a recent campaign against animal abuse, refers to bestiality as “animal sexual abuse” and explains it as the “sexual molestation of an animal by a human.” The Society further relates that “animal sexual abuse, like rape, is the eroticization of violence, control, and exploitation.” The Humane Society explains, in its *Animal Abuse Information Packet*, that “sexual molestation of animals” may physically injure or even kill the animal. It provides examples of dogs with severe rectal tearing from anal sexual contact with humans, cats killed by penetration by humans, chickens decapitated, animals beaten, stabbed, or mutilated during or after sexual contact, and more. It further states that many animals are physically restrained during the “abuse.” The Humane Society (1998) concludes that all “sexual molestation” of an animal by a human is abuse, even when the “abuse” does not involve physical injury to the animal.

Ascione (1993) relates that bestiality can be considered abusive even in cases when physical harm to the animal does not occur, and he compares bestiality to sexual abuse of children where consent is assumed to be impossible. He explains that animals are unable to be fully informed about the sexual activity, they cannot communicate consent, and they are unable to speak out about their “abuse.” Steirmann (1966) states that the animal involved in sexual relations with a human being does not get much pleasure from the act. In fact, the author relates that the animal probably derives no pleasure at all from this type of activity. Usually, when the animal is involved with a woman, it must be drugged or otherwise stimulated in order to perform the act of penetration (Steirmann, 1966).

The argument in return, according to Fox (1994) and Queen (1997), is that animals are indeed capable of saying “no” with their claws, hooves, and teeth. Moreover, animals do not have the hang-ups or psychological reactions (as far as we can tell) which humans may have. Therefore, as long as the relationship is conducted with kindness and respect for the animal’s wishes, the animal is probably not going to be traumatized by sexual contact with a human. To animals, sex is just a part of life, like eating and sleeping (Fox, 1994; Queen, 1997). Tanka (1995) states that a zoosexual who expects sex from his four-legged partner, is not all that much different from an animal owner who expects his/her animal to help pull a load, plow a field, track a deer, or win a race or a competition.

Rosenberger (1968) believes that animals show their consent by being passive. The animals usually do not seem to object, and when in heat, seem even to enjoy it (Greenwood, 1963). Blake (1971) suggests that when it comes to the farm boy who uses a calf or cow, or the shepherd who uses goats or sheep, the animal is not hurt, and may even enjoy the act. In these cases, “It would not be a ‘socially acceptable’ practice, but it seems that it would be normal within the structure of this criterion” (Blake, 1971, p. 21).

It is a well known phenomenon that monkeys will readily masturbate before menstruating women peering into their cages (Rosenberger, 1968). There is also no doubt that dogs are often very sexually excited

by the presence of women, especially when the latter are menstruating (Cauldwell, 1948 & 1968; Rosenberger, 1968). There are recorded instances in which animals have made distinctly sexual advances toward men or women (Ford & Beach, 1951). Furthermore, it is not an uncommon practice for dogs to hump on the legs of people of both genders, and to perform coital movements (Cauldwell, 1948 & 1968; Queen, 1997). Rosenberger (1968) emphasizes that as far as cunnilingus is concerned, dogs require no training, and even Dekkers (1994) and Menninger (1951) admit that sometimes animals take the initiative and do so impulsively.

While a dog cannot be considered a consenting adult, dogs usually have rather drastic methods of showing their dislike for something (Russell, 1971). The dog regards all the members of its household as fellow dogs, and is a willing sexual partner to all of them, especially when he has no access to his own kind. A dog that is regularly being masturbated becomes fixated upon human beings, and may no longer even look at other dogs for sexual outlets (Dekkers, 1994). According to Masters (1962), perhaps the best evidence that an animal does not suffer either physically or psychologically as the result of human-animal sexual relations is the observation that animals often tend to become very devoted to the humans with whom they have such relations, and some of the animals even avoid intercourse with their own species thereafter (Masters, 1962). Sparks (1977) believes that dogs that are brought up from puppyhood in the company of people, come to reject their own kind in favor of their human masters for all things (Sparks, 1977). “Mammals of various types can establish mating relationships with human beings, so that they become customary and anticipated by the animal” (Money, 1981, p. 97).

In an article about zoophilia that appeared in *The Guide*'s March 1996 issue, a national gay monthly, Anthony, one of the zoos interviewed, says: “If an animal consents to sex, he runs up to you, knocks you down, and fucks you. If an animal does not consent to sex, it will kick you or bite you or run away. I see absolutely no ambiguity there. I think consent with animals is a much less hazy a notion than it is with humans” (Andriette, 1996). Tanka (1995), who is also a zoo, states that a zoosexual, in general, tends to believe in the animal's right to itself and its sexual choices. Thus consent is very important. Those who do not obtain consent from their animal partner are committing rape!

Another zoo communicates that the animal is free to kick, bite or otherwise damage the individual who tries to do something to it that the animal does not want to do. The fact that animals do not refuse in these ways, while not the same as explicit consent, shows that the animals tend not to mind, if not even to enjoy the sexual act (Kurrelgyre, 1995). The majority of zoophiles and bestialists truly love animals and would not hurt them. The animals seem to return their affection, and sometimes they even seem to enjoy the sexual activities with their human partners (Bledsoe, 1965).

Tanka (1995) explains that when a person begins, for example, to scratch a cat's ears or under its chin, he/she can tell whether the cat likes it or not, and whether it wants the person to keep scratching or not by its behavior. If the cat purrs and pushes against our fingers, the cat must enjoy it. Is it safe to say that the cat is even consenting to it? If it did not want it, the cat would have gotten up and moved away, or it would have shown its displeasure in another manner (Tanka, 1995). Queen (1997) adds that one of the reasons people like animals is the primal pleasure of communicating with them. She further relates the accusation “that a dog who licks peanut butter off your hand is getting a treat, while the same dog licking peanut butter off a dick is being sexually abused” (p. 15) is absurd. In the “dog-world,” sex doesn't mean the same thing it does to humans; dogs do not wear clothes to cover their genitals, they do not hide their sexual activities, and they have no problem leg-humping a stranger in public (Queen, 1997).

According to Tanka (1995), sex with animals is very different from pedophilia, which is often equated with bestiality when it comes to consent. He offers the following six distinctions: (1) Children will almost certainly be damaged psychologically, while animals are not subject to social pressures; (2) children are not biologically ready for sex, which can lead to physical injury. On the other hand, no zoophile will ever knowingly do anything sexual with an animal that could result in physical harm to the animal; (3) children do not understand what is going on, because they have not yet developed a sexual maturity, while an adult animal has a sex drive, often a very strong one; (4) children tend to be very easily coerced by adults. On the other hand, although reluctant animals can be pressured and trained to tolerate sexual acts, if an animal refuses to put up with sex, it can, and will, resist in a very obvious way; (5) children can be physically overpowered by an adult, while it is very difficult to overpower an animal; and (6) children are not animals! We do not eat children

or breed children for appearance or any other reason. We do not hunt children, do not perform medical experiments on them, and we do not sterilize children (Tanka, 1995).

Many zoos find satisfaction purely in giving pleasure to the animal (Kurrelgyre, 1995). In a guide on "How to have more fun with your mare," the author, on the Internet, gives advice on how to pleasure the mare, and explains how and where exactly to touch her, so that she will enjoy it. In other "how to" guides, frequently posted on alt.sex.bestiality, one can find instructions on how to tell if the animal is in the mood for sex, and specific suggestions such as to cut one's nails and file them before he/she engages in any sexual act with an animal, lest one physically hurt the animal (Equinox, 1995).

Dekkers (1994) reminds the reader that, in fact, the sexual life of animals is completely organized by human beings; they either neuter or breed the animals (Dekkers, 1994). According to Masters (1962), it is interesting to note that those who are concerned about bestiality being an act of cruelty to the animal, are not at all so concerned about the use of animals for heavy labor, their unnatural confinement as household pets, their slaughter for food, their being placed on display in zoos, and their being hunted down and maimed or killed as a sport. Leal (1989) concludes: "A logic that considers that sex with animals, but not killing and eating the same animals, to be abusive, is at least paradoxical" (Leal, 1989, p. 285).

Animals' Cross-Breeding

Kinsey *et al.* (1948) note that the phenomenon of animals mating with individuals of other species has been observed. Haerberle (1978) relates that sexual intercourse is not so very unusual between animals of different species as it is between humans and animals. "When one examines the observed cases of such crosses, and especially the rather considerable number of instances in which primates, including man, have been involved, one begins to suspect that the rules about intraspecific mating are not so universal as tradition would have it" (Kinsey *et al.*, 1948, p. 668). Kinsey *et al.* (1953) further point out that genetic studies have shown the existence of a large number of inter-specific hybrids, that have occurred in the wild, and others add that careful investigations have found that interspecies mating is a natural occurrence (Cauldwell, 1968; Ford & Beach, 1951; Harris, 1969; Masters, 1962; Ullerstam, 1966).

Swine have been seen to mate with sheep. A sow in heat will try to mount a sheep, a dog, a goat, or even a human male (Rosenfeld, 1967). Apes and monkeys will commonly seek sexual relationships with humans, as well as with other species. Caged monkeys and apes make sexual advances to both women and men, and the mandrill and the gorilla are supposed to be very attracted to female human beings (Bagley, 1968).

According to Masters (1962), "man's desire to mate with members of species other than his own is quite natural, and parallels tendencies to be found among other representatives of the animal world" (Masters, 1962, p. 8). Therefore, although bestiality may be condemned, it is not a violation of the natural order of things (Masters, 1962). Hunt (1974) states that since human beings are so much less rigidly guided by instinct than other animals, it is arguable that sexual relations between humans and animals is less of a violation of inherent patterns of stimulation and response than are other cross-species matings (Hunt, 1974).

According to Dekkers (1994), however, animals tend to observe the taboo against the sexual transgression of species boundaries, although both in captivity and in the wild we have seen examples of animals which pay no attention to species boundaries. The author further explains that reports of animals who tried to "seduce" human beings primarily occur when the animals are in captivity. In such circumstances animals often become infatuated with human beings. A male dog trying to mount visitors' legs probably saw as a puppy in its sensitive period, between one and two months old, too few dogs and too many people. This, Dekkers notes, is known as the process of imprinting. There are others who agree with Dekker's (1994) view; animals with but few exceptions are attracted only to others of the opposite sex and of the same species (Dubois-Desaulle, 1933; Moll, 1933), because their inherited reactive capacity consists of responding to such stimuli (Moll, 1933).

Bestiality and the Art

There is abundance of folklore, paintings, sculptures, films, and pornography, dealing with bestiality (Masters, 1962). Erotic literature and drawings, including some of the world's great art, have used bestiality themes repeatedly (Kinsey *et al.*, 1953). Dubois-Desaulle's translator (A.F.N., 1933) points out that the literary use of bestiality has had an exceedingly long history, and that we find it present in many folk-tales. These folk-tales usually are of two general types: those in which the animal changes into a handsome man (sometimes also to a beautiful woman), and those that deal with animals per se. Some of these tales result in animal/human births. These tales are found throughout the world and among all peoples.

In children's stories and fairy tales from all over the world, we find numerous examples of man's interest in, and fascination with, animals. People love to tell of mermaids, vampires, werewolves, unicorns, satyrs, and more. Man seems to have an unconscious but relentless romance with animals (Edenn, 1971). Harris (1969) relates that even among children's fairy tales, there is much speculation regarding the true nature of the relationship between the heroine and the creature. For example, the original children's story *Little Red Riding Hood* is filled with bestial references (Blake, 1972).

Literary references are widespread: *Goldilocks and the Three Bears* (Donofrio, 1996), *Little Red Riding Hood and the Big Bad Wolf*, (Blake, 1972; Donofrio, 1996; Masters, 1962), and *The Frog Prince* of Grimm's Fairy Tales (Cornog & Perper, 1994; Donofrio, 1996; Harris, 1969; Menninger, 1951), *Beauty and the Beast* (Cornog & Perper, 1994; Donofrio, 1996; Harris, 1969; Masters, 1962), stories in *The Book of the Thousand Nights and One Night*, such as the one where the wazir's daughter has sex with an enormous ape (Cornog & Perper, 1994; Dekkers, 1994), Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Cornog & Perper, 1994), Balzac's *A Passion in the Desert* (Cornog & Perper, 1994), *A Night in a Moorish Harem* by Lord George Herbert, which includes a poetic account of a girl's sexual encounter with a stallion (Love, 1992), the epic poem *Roan Stallion* by Robinson Jeffers, in which a woman seeks greater satisfaction than her lifeless marriage with her dull husband can give her, and falls in love with a stallion (Dekkers, 1994), and Emile Zola's *La Terre* from the 1880's (L'Etalon Doux, 1996). Bestiality appears in the works of Shakespeare, Dickens, James Joyce, William Faulkner, and of course, D. H. Lawrence (Donofrio, 1996). Even comic books such as *Alien Sex* and *Monster Lust* often depict bestiality themes, in which aliens or monsters rape and have sexual relations with beautiful women (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992c).

Bestiality themes also appear in the ballet *Swan Lake* (Cornog & Perper, 1994; Donofrio, 1996), the play *Futz* which depicts a farmer who loves a pig (Bryant, 1982; Essen, 1969; Hunt, 1974), Woody Allen's movie *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex* (Cornog & Perper, 1994; Hunt, 1974), in a 1987's film *Max Mon Amour, Max My Love*, made by the Japanese director Nagisa Oshima, where an English diplomat discovers that his wife is having an affair with a chimpanzee, which she loves and keeps hidden in a hotel (Dekkers, 1994), the MGM comedy film *Airplane II* which contains a satire about a sex act between a nymphomaniac blonde passenger and a donkey (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992), the 20th Century Fox comedy movie *Bachelor Party* which depicts a hilarious satire on a woman/donkey act (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1992b), and of course, the famous *King Kong* (Donofrio, 1996).

Bestiality themes are also very popular in drawings and sculptures. Neret's book (1994), *Erotica Universalis* is a collection of more than 750 erotic art works dating from around 5000 B.C. (rock drawings) to modern time. At least 25 (3.33%) of them depict bestiality. Michelangelo, and many others, painted scenes of Leda and Zeus in the form of a swan (Love, 1992; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991), and Agostino Carracchi did an engraving titled *Satyr and Nymph* in 1590, of a half-man/half-goat having explicit intercourse with a woman (Love, 1992).

Hunt (1974) and Bryant (1982) comment about the changing social attitudes toward bestiality. Social attitudes toward individuals who engage in bestiality have long been extremely hostile. However, it seems that the subject has become more common of late in pornographic writing, films, and sex shows. The public's hostile attitudes have apparently moderated to something more like scorn and amusement. For example, the satirical play *Futz* depicts a man who both spiritually and carnally loves a pig. The Woody Allen movie *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex* devoted a long sequence to the presumably hilarious idea that a successful young New York physician could fall in love with a sheep (Hunt, 1974).

From the earliest writings and early folklore, tales of sexual contact between humans and animals have focused on female humans and a variety of animal species (Dekkers, 1994; Ellison, 1970; Haeberle, 1978; Kinsey *et al.*, 1953; *The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991). According to Blake (1971), in mythology and fiction we read much more about female bestiality than about the male's because the male, with his higher libido and more sexual freedom, likes to think of females having intercourse with animals, just as he enjoys the thought of two women in a lesbian encounter. Dekkers (1994) further explains that the reason for depicting more female bestiality in the arts is that most of the artists have been men, and their art corresponds with the male fantasies. Those men identify with the active party — the animal. Dekkers goes further to say that the fact that men identify with the animals is best illustrated by all the myths and stories in which men actually turn into animals (Dekkers, 1994).

Dijkstra (1986), in a book on female sexuality as it has been portrayed in 19th century art, points out that the artists of the period around the turn of the 20th century did everything they could to feed the fantasy of female bestiality. He points out that late 19th century men who found themselves caught up in a prosaic, boring, materialistic world of their own making, could not admit to erotic fantasies of their own. Therefore they used women, conveniently, to supply the fantasies, and then, of course, to take the blame for them.

Ellison (1970) and Stone (1992) argue that mankind has always been fascinated by the idea of sex with other animals, and that bestiality seems to occur much more in fantasy and in fantasy-projection situations such as stag films, books, sex shows, and art than it occurs in reality. Edenn (1971) has a similar view. The author explains that the symbols and images which arise in people's art, culture, mythology, religion, and dreams are nothing more than the representations of the archaic contents buried deep in their minds. Although hidden in our unconsciousness, these ancient contents continue to control our reactions and our emotions (Edenn, 1971).

According to Dekkers (1994), over the centuries, people have enjoyed scenes of bestiality decorating their homes. Paintings of Leda and the Swan, Europa and the Bull, and the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove fertilizing the Virgin Mary have been popular decorations in many homes and elsewhere (Dekkers, 1994).

Blake (1972) points out that bestial symbolism is seen in the most respectable fashion magazines, in various advertisements, and in one fashion or another, in almost every form of the media today. He further describes jokes, myths, legends, and fantasies of bestial content that have been common to a great percentage of the population since the beginning of recorded history. Braun (1967) relates that the many obscene jokes which exist about the sexual relations between animals and humans, and their popularity suggest that in many people they find a lustful sympathy (Braun, 1967).

Bestiality is also a common sexual theme in pornography (Holmes, 1991). Dewaraja and Money (1986) suggest that pornography does not cause paraphilia (in this case zoophilia). The correct sequence, they state, is that developmentally, the paraphilia comes first. Paraphilic pornography is able to stimulate sexually only those who already have the same type of paraphilic imagery built into their lovemap (Money, 1986). Ellison (1970), however, argues that bestiality depicted in pornography is not produced and marketed to secret bestialists, but rather to "countless thousands of us who are otherwise sexually normal, as it were, (who) are utterly fascinated by the depiction" (Ellison, 1970, p. 215).

As mentioned before, in an analysis of the Latin American (Mexican, Cuban) pornography of the 1930s through the 1950s, Di-Lauro and Rabkin (1976) found that bestiality was a common theme. Films such as *Rin Tin Tin Mexicano*, *A Hunter and His Dog*, *Rascal Rex*, and *El Perro Masajista* all depict bestiality acts. *The Wild Animal Revue* (1991b) further describes a series of 8mm stag films, which appeared during the early 1930s, known as the "Mexican Dog" series. Issue number 11 of *The Wild Animal Revue* (1994/95) describes Brazilian donkey films.

The Pet Book series from Greenleaf Classics in San Diego, California, has flourished since the early 1970s. The Pet Books are explicit, and intend to excite the erotic fantasies of men and women who enjoy fantasizing about sexual relations with animals (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991). There are also the Color Climax' 8mm animal films, such as *Dog Fuckers*, *Horse Lovers*, and *Horsepower*, all from 1970. Another two 8mm stag films appeared in the early 1970s in which Linda Lovelace performed sexually with a large dog. Lovelace, however, steadfastly denied her participation in those films (*The Wild Animal Revue*, 1991).

Understanding Bestiality and Zoophilia

Although not readily available currently in the American commercial market, magazines which depict explicit pictures of bestiality, such as *Animal Bizarre*, *Animal Special*, *Dog Instruction*, and *Donkey Sex* are very popular in Denmark (Donofrio, 1996). According to Taylor (1996), city people, even in the United States, are able to find inflatable substitutes for farm animals, through mail-order catalogs which motivate potential buyers to “enjoy the pleasures of country life without the smell” (Taylor, 1996, pp. 248-249).

CHAPTER 4

STUDIES CONCERNING BESTIALITY AND ZOOPHILIA

The most important part of a literature review is the review of other studies on the related topic. Research on bestiality or zoophilia is scarce (Davis & Whitten, 1987), and out-dated. In a search I conducted in the Library of Congress' data-base of dissertations since 1970, there were only 17 dissertations that dealt with bestiality. All but two discussed the topic as it appears in literature and art in various places and time periods in history. The other two were discussed in previous sections (Leal, 1989; Penyak, 1993) and are briefly presented in this section as well. Other historical and cultural studies by Liliequist (1988), Monter (1981), and Morris (1988) were also described previously in this book and are briefly presented here as well.

Most works on bestiality involve "case studies," and are usually written in a pseudo-scientific manner. There is a number of phony psychological studies, actually designed to sell erotic stories under the guise of case histories. They pretend to be authoritative, documented, and factual sex studies. The authors of these books discuss Kinsey's findings, and mention other well known sexologists to make their works seem scientifically based. The reliability of these popular books on bestiality is open to question. These books tend to preach against bestiality, and to refer to bestialists as morally repulsive psychopaths. Four such pseudo-scientific studies are presented in this chapter (Dumont, 1970; Rosenfeld, 1967; Trimble, 1969; Waine, 1968).

The five most relevant and important studies for comparison purposes with the current study are: Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin's (1948) study on the sexual behaviors of American men; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard's (1953) study on the sexual behaviors of American women; the Hunt survey (1974); Peretti and Rowan (1983); and Donofrio (1996).

The following is a chronological description of research findings and related studies, including the four examples of pseudo-scientific reports which are highly questionable as to their validity and reliability. The studies are presented in chronological order. Again, some of the studies are described in length while others are only briefly mentioned. This depends on both the amount of information available and on my subjective sense of the study's importance. Some of the studies were mentioned or described previously in this book.

Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin (1948)

The studies on male and female (discussed later) sexual behavior in America by Kinsey *et al.*, despite their inherent flaws and much criticism, remain the most monumental studies of human sexual behavior ever conducted that provide a glimpse into the phenomenon of bestiality/zoophilia. These two studies took into consideration various sexual outlets for men and women, and were the first to acknowledge animal sexual contacts as a separate and distinct sexual outlet.

The findings of the 1948 report are based on personal interviews with 5300 white, adult American males. In their sample of males, one man in about 13 had sexual experience with animals, and Kinsey *et al.* estimate the number to be eight percent of the male population in the United States. The authors report, however, that for most individuals, "animal contacts" do not occur more than a few times in a lifetime.

Kinsey *et al.* state that animal sexual contacts are largely confined to farm boys, since they have access to animals. When the authors take into consideration all sorts of animal sexual contact, either with or without orgasm, and include all ages, they estimate that between 40 to 50 percent of all farm boys engage in this behavior. Kinsey *et al.* further suggest that these are minimum data, since there was some "cover-up" in the subjects' reports and they may not have been completely honest. The authors communicate that animal sexual contact is more common among people who live on Western United States farms. They also point out that in certain Western areas, where social restraints on sexual contact with animals are less strict, the incidence is as high as 65 percent of the population. Kinsey *et al.*, however, fail to report the size of these populations.

Of the men who ever had sexual contact with animals, Kinsey *et al.* found that a third had their first experience by the age of nine. Kinsey and his associates relate that about six percent of their sample was involved in “animal contacts” during early adolescence. The figure dropped to about one percent in the population of single men over 20. For unmarried men who lived in rural areas, the incidents ranged from 11 percent at 11–15 years of age to four percent at 25 years of age. The authors conclude that social taboos and restrictions lead the older individual to cover up this activity, to deny it, and to even stop it at a rather early age.

The authors point out that differences in social level affect this form of sexual outlet. This activity was highest among boys who lived in rural areas, and who ultimately went to college. In this group, about 28 percent of boys up to age 15 had intercourse with animals, and 17 percent engaged in intercourse with animals between the ages 16 and 20. Of the total population of rural males, 14 – 16 percent of the grade school level, 20 percent of the high school level, and 26 – 28 percent of the college level, had some “animal experience” to the point of orgasm. Kinsey *et al.* conclude that over half of the rural males who have a college education, have had some kind of sexual contact with animals.

Kinsey *et al.* defined “animal contacts” as penile/vaginal intercourse and anal and oral manipulations which provided orgasm to the human males. They found that up to age 15, boys who engaged in animal contacts did so for a maximum of eight times a week. By age 30, the figure dropped to once a week. The authors relate that there are too few active cases to generalize for older people, although there are cases of animal intercourse that extend into the fifties, and they had one case of a man who was over 80 years old. They conclude that “the picture is one of decreasing incidence, decreasing frequency, and decreasing significance in the later years; but the cases are so few... that these data are not readily interpreted...” (p. 262). For most males, however, the frequency of sexual contact with animals was about two or three times a week. The authors further point out that in most cases, the contacts with animals last for two or three years, although there are contacts that extend over several years, or even throughout a lifetime.

In the urban population, about four percent of grade school boys were involved in animal sex between the onset of adolescence and 15, and at the high school level, this incidence dropped to between one and four percent. The frequencies for urban boys were much lower than for rural boys, and Kinsey *et al.* relate that farm boys have 30 to 70 experiences for every one which the city boy has. The authors express their surprise that the city boy was involved in animal sex at all, since he has less exposure to animals than the farm boy. The authors further point out that most of the city boys’ experience with animals occurred when they visited farms, which “suggests that the entire human male population might have animal contacts as frequently as farm boys do if animals were available to all of them” (p. 671).

Kinsey *et al.* found that animals involved in human sexual contacts included all species domesticated or kept as pets. Calves, burros and sheep were most often involved, but every other mammal that has ever been kept on a farm including dogs and cats was reported as well. Larger birds such as chickens, ducks, and geese were also part of this category.

According to Kinsey *et al.*, vaginal intercourse and masturbation of the animal by the boy were the most common practices, followed by fellatio of the boy (usually by a calf). There was some anal intercourse, and in some cases the boy masturbated by rubbing against the body of the animal. In other cases, the boy fellated the male animal. Masturbation of the animal was done on both male and female animals, but was more common with a male animal. The boy might masturbate himself while masturbating the animal, while achieving erotic stimulation from the experience. Frequently, a group of boys might be involved in masturbating an animal.

Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard (1953)

As mentioned before, the study on female sexual behavior in America by Kinsey *et al.*, despite its inherent flaws and much criticism, remains one of the most monumental studies of human sexual behavior ever conducted that provides a glimpse into the phenomenon of bestiality/zoophilia. The related findings in this study are the result of 5793 interviews with adult white American females.

The incidence and frequency of animal sexual contact reported by the females in Kinsey *et al.*’s sample, were much lower than those of the males in the 1948 study. Only 1.5 percent of the total female sample

had some sort of sexual contact with an animal in pre-adolescence and this contact was usually unintentional, resulting either from curiosity, or through the household pet's approach. Of all the women who reported sexual contact with an animal during pre-adolescence, 20 percent reported reaching orgasm through these experiences.

An additional 3.6 percent of the females interviewed by Kinsey *et al.* reported having had sexual contact with animals after they had become adolescents, but only 1.2 percent reported repeated genital contacts, oral sex or intercourse. Half of the women who had sex with animals (1.8%), had these contacts after the onset of adolescence and before age 21. There were, however, 95 females who had had such contacts at a later age. In about half of the cases, animal contact was limited to a single experience. Most of the women reporting sexual contact with animals were single, and most of them were better educated than other segments of the sample.

Seventy four percent of the women involved with animals had sexual contact with dogs. The most common activity reported was general body contact with the animal. Other activities included touching the animal's genitalia, masturbation of the animal, and being "orally manipulated" by the animal. One woman reported actual intercourse with an animal, and two other cases of coitus with dogs were reported among the females who had pre-adolescent animal sexual experience.

About half of the women with any experience of bestiality reported only a single episode, and less than a quarter had six or more episodes. Most of the women had their animal contacts within a single year of their lives.

Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy and Christenson (1965)

This study compared different types of sex offenders on several issues, one of them was their sexual experiences with animals. The study is based on sexual histories obtained in interviews with more than a thousand white males convicted for one or more sex offenses (defined as the total sex offender group), as well as 881 white males who had never been convicted of committing a sex offense, but who had been convicted of other misdemeanors or felonies (defined as the prison group), and 471 white males who had never been convicted for anything beyond traffic violations (defined as the control group).

Their definition of "animal contact" was limited to activities occurring after the onset of puberty, to sexual activities which were engaged in for the purpose of the gratification of the human participant, and to penile penetration of the body. The researchers excluded, for example, the masturbation of dogs, "which is a not infrequent experiment by juveniles" (p. 654). Therefore, it is probably safe to conclude that their data on the incidence of human-animal sexual contacts are understated.

Both the control group (N=471) and the heterosexual sex offenders against adults (convicted of sexual contact, without the use of force or threat, with females aged 16 and older who were not related to them, N=216) contained the fewest incidences of animal contacts (8.3%, which follows Kinsey *et al.*'s estimate about the general population), while the heterosexual aggressors against minors (adult males convicted of sexual contact, with the use of force or threat, with female children between the ages of 12 and 15, who were not their daughters, N=27) contained the most (33.3%). Aside from these groups, the incidence of animal contact ranged from 12.5 to 24 percent. The homosexual sex offenders against children who were under the age of 12 (N=96) and against adults (N=195) both contained 24 percent of animal contact cases. Incest offenders against children and homosexual offenders against minors (male children between the ages of 12 and 15) both contained 22 percent.

The homosexual offenders were not particularly rural, and in fact, the homosexual sex offenders against adults were the least rural of any group. Overall, however, the correlation between rurality and the incidence of animal sexual contact became evident when comparing within each group the percentages of individuals with experience in animal contact according to whether they came from urban, incidentally rural, or more than incidentally rural places. In nine of the 12 available comparative groups, the percentage of individuals with such experience is highest among the more than incidentally rural (which follows Kinsey *et al.*'s findings).

Overall, more individuals in this study had animal contact than fantasized or dreamed of such experiences. This lack of psychological involvement led the researchers to suggest that animal contact is closely related to self-masturbation.

Rosenfeld (1967)

Rosenfeld's book is an example of a pseudo-scientific work, by an individual who claims to be a professional in the field of sexology. His study's validity and reliability remain questionable.

Rosenfeld provides conflicting messages throughout his book. While he states that if the act of bestiality does not physically harm the animal nor the bestialist, there is no reason for society to be concerned with bestiality, he also perceives individuals who have sexual relations with animals as very sick people, and calls the act perverse and repugnant. He stresses that his study must be approached with complete objectivity, and at the same time he reports telling the people in his study that "the only positive method is to quit" (p. 131). Rosenfeld further states that his study comprises the most complete information on the scope and practices of bestiality.

Rosenfeld relates that he became interested in the issue of bestiality/zoophilia after receiving hundred of letters from those who read a previous book he wrote about psychosexual pathology. He began his research by replying to those correspondents who mentioned their interest in bestiality, and offered to interview them. Rosenfeld's sample reportedly consisted of 246 men and women who were zoophiles and bestialists. His method of data collection was a personal, tape recorded, interview. Unfortunately, Rosenfeld did not use any statistical analysis to interpret his data, nor did he provide the questions used in the interview.

The "subjects" in his study resided primarily in Oregon, South Dakota, Mississippi, South Carolina, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. Their ages ranged from 18 to 72, with a reported median age of middle 30s. The vast majority were Protestants, a few were Roman Catholics, and about a fourth were agnostics. Not one of the subjects was Jewish, and the author concludes that Jews compose a very tiny minority regarding this "perversion," if at all. Ethnic background of the majority was Anglo-Saxon, with no "Orientals," and only one African American. Rosenfeld reports that his sample contained a cross-section of all classes and occupations. The median level of education, he says, was 12 and a half years of schooling.

According to Rosenfeld, the majority of bestialists have normal I.Q. and some are superior on the scale of intelligence. They are usually not moral psychopaths; they reportedly feel that there is nothing morally wrong with having sex with animals. His sample, he says, consisted of people who simply like to have intercourse with animals, and they derive enough sexual pleasure from it to compensate for the fear of being caught and becoming social outcasts.

All but three of Rosenfeld's subjects had other sexual outlets which they enjoyed at least as much as their sexual contacts with animals. Approximately 10 percent of the men reported homosexual activities. These men were highly educated and were married with children. Some of the men in his sample reported swinging in "wife-swapping" groups, others reported sex with children, and more than 30 of these men reported incestuous activities among other "perversions." Practically all the women in the study reported sex with teen-age boys.

According to Rosenfeld's findings, the men preferred heifers (the majority of male farmer bestialists had sexual relations with heifers that were five to 12 months old) and/or cows, followed by swine and sheep. Five men trained male dogs to have anal intercourse with them. The author describes his skepticism of these claims, and relates that anal intercourse performed by a male dog on a human being is dangerous and almost impossible.

Rosenfeld reports that the majority of women bestialists prefer dogs, both for sexual intercourse and for cunnilingus. The author explains that dogs have a larger tongue, seem to enjoy the taste of the vaginal secretion, and can perform the act for a long while. Some of the women in his study had trained their pet cats to perform cunnilingus and to suck their nipples. A tiny minority of the men and women in this study admitted to performing oral sex upon their animal partners. Rosenfeld concludes that these people suffered from "a severe sexual neurosis" (p. 130).

Rosenfeld further concludes that in general, all men and women in the study seemed to be well oriented to their life's situation, and all exhibited good emotional states. All enjoyed alcohol, but alcohol did not seem to be a factor in their preference for animal sex. Rosenfeld also reports that many of the subjects who lived and worked in the city, owned homes in the suburbs where they kept various animals. The Catholic subjects did not exhibit as much guilt over their behaviors as did the Protestants and many had no concern over their sexual activities with animals. Rosenfeld hypothesizes that this may be because Catholics have access to the Confessional. On the other hand, many did report apprehension over their "perverse acts" with human beings...

Rosenfeld summarizes his findings as follows: (1) There are some people for whom bestiality is a way of life, and they see no reason to change. (2) We cannot label any sexual practice "perverted" simply because the majority does not engage in it (this statement is very surprising since Rosenfeld himself does it throughout the book). (3) While the practice of bestiality is disgusting to the average person, the bestialist harms no one: not himself, not the animal, nor society. The author further points out that the practice of bestiality is less evil and less degrading than the swapping of mates.

Rosenfeld further concludes that when the bestialist prefers human to animal relations exclusively over human to human relationships, he/she is considered psychotic or the result of a "very intensified compensating neurosis" (p. 118), and needs medical treatment.

Grassberger (1968 in Dekkers, 1994)

Ronald Grassberger (1968, *Die unzech mit Tieren*, Springer, Vienna/New York), as reported by Dekkers (1994), analyzed the Austrian court proceedings from 1923 to 1965. According to Dekkers, this study seems to be reliable, but unfortunately, the author does not provide much information about it.

Grassberger found that approximately 50 people annually were sentenced for bestiality, most of them males from the countryside. Grassberger, however, estimated that the actual incidence of bestiality was about four or five times higher than the cases that were reported. He estimated that between one and two percent of men in the countryside occasionally had sexual contact with animals.

Vaginal copulation with cows and oral manipulation of the men's penises by calves appeared to be the most common sexual behavior with animals, followed by intercourse with mares, foals, and goats. Sheep and pigs were five times less popular than goats. Only one percent of those sentenced in Austria for bestiality were women, and they had sexual contacts with dogs.

Dekkers (1994) reports that Grassberger believed that between 49 and 57 percent of those who committed bestiality were mentally retarded or morons.

Waine (1968)

Waine's work about human sexual involvement with dogs is based on interviews with professional party dog breeders (trainers of dogs for sexual practices with humans). This book is another example of a pseudo-scientific work, supposedly written with the hope that it will help the reader avoid sexual involvement with dogs by recognizing the "evil invoked." The author "explains" that sexual involvement with dogs, although objectionable, must be researched and understood; only after all the facts are understood can proper evaluation be done and the road to recovery from, and elimination of, sexual involvement with dogs begin.

Most of the party dog trainers interviewed for this study came from one major West Coast city. The majority of party dog trainers were married couples, but no further common denominators were found among them. The author does not provide the number of people he had interviewed. She reports that each trainer was asked the same series of questions, and presents one complete interview in her book.

Waine reports that those who indulge in sexual relations with dogs generally see no perversion in what they are doing; it is simply a pleasurable experience with an intimate and a faithful friend. In their opinion it is physically satisfying, mentally stimulating, and causes no physical harm to either party. Further, it is a

convenient pleasure that is readily available without cost. According to Waive's records, the people involved in canine sex are rarely oversexed, and they do not give up human relationships, but enhance them with the spice of variety.

According to Waive, most people who engage in sexual relations with dogs are between the ages of 30 to 35. Most of them are mature, well educated, and financially secure. The majority of people who actively participate in bestiality are those least likely to be suspected. Most of these people suffer no apparent guilt nor remorse from their behavior. The author further points out that sexual relations between man and dog in the past few centuries have been limited almost exclusively to the white man. According to Waive, two-thirds of all party dog purchasers are married couples who want an animal that is trained to have sex with both genders.

Waive found four common surgical procedures that dog owners sometimes perform on their dogs to enhance their sexual activities. These are: enlargement of the vaginal entrance (for female dogs), enlargement of the anal opening of both male and female dogs, severing the sheath skin from the abdomen in the male dog to allow the dog's penis to hang freely down from the body, and tightening the sheath skin in other male dogs to better their sexual performance.

Trimble (1969)

Trimble's book is another pseudo-scientific work that appears to be more of a pornographic book than anything else. He claims that his "study" is the result of a year of concentrated research into contemporary female bestiality. Approximately one hundred interviews were reportedly conducted, but in his book the researcher presents only 14 of them. Many of the interviews were conducted with women who only fantasize about bestial acts, or with individuals who saw or heard of such bestial experiences. One interview, for example, was conducted with a college psychology student who told about his female bestiality observations. It is interesting to note that this college student reported the use of bestiality as one of the methods the psychology graduate students employed at the school lab. The student does not describe these experiments in detail, nor mention the university where these experiments took place.

Trimble points out that most of the people involved in bestial activities are not mental patients, and that the majority of them have never sought professional help. Trimble, however, perceives a person's preference for animal sex as a perversion. He comments that in his view, most of these women are mentally ill, or at least unstable. Nevertheless, Trimble believes that knowledge in this field can help us understand this "sexual malady" and "may guide some of those afflicted to seek the help they need" (p. 28).

Trimble relates that cunnilingus is one of the most popular forms of female bestiality. He explains that this is so because cunnilingus is adaptable to any size of animal, it is easy to perform, and many dogs and other animals are attracted by the scent of the women's odors and secretions.

Dumont (1970)

Dumont, in a pseudo-scientific book, reviews many cases of bestiality, all of which, according to the author, have been taken from case histories and studies compiled by the author and his associates, psychiatrists, psychologists, and other professionals. The intention of the author is to explore the practice of bestiality among the women from the "upper crust" of our society.

According to Dumont, the majority of the women he "studied" not only had sexual experiences with their pets, but would seek out human relationships as well. He also found that most of these women chose dogs for their sexual activities, since dogs are readily available as pets, and can be easily trained and carried about without causing any raised eyebrows. The author makes the point that since Kinsey's time, interest in household pets has dramatically increased, and therefore there is room to speculate that bestiality with non-barnyard animals has also increased.

Dumont concludes there are six major reasons for women to seek bestiality: (1) a loosening of morals, (2) financial freedom, (3) boredom, (4) outgrowth of other sexual aberrations, (5) sexual experimentation during youth, and (6) substitution for human sexual partners.

Hunt (1974)

The Playboy Foundation asked the Research Guild, Inc., an independent market survey and behavioral research organization, to design and administer a sex information questionnaire, including questions about bestiality, to a representative sample of adults throughout the United States. Morton Hunt then analyzed and interpreted the findings. The following are the findings and analysis of the data, compared with the two Kinsey studies, as presented by Hunt.

All in all, 982 men and 1044 women completed the questionnaires in 1972. Ninety percent were white, and 10 percent were black. Seventy one percent of the participants were married at the time, 25 percent were never-married, and four percent were previously married but currently single. The population for the study was chosen by using a random selection of names from 24 cities.

Hunt's data, when compared with Kinsey *et al.*'s, indicate that the percentages of men and women who have ever had sexual contacts with animals have sharply declined. For men, Hunt's overall incidence of bestiality was 4.9 percent, compared to Kinsey *et al.*'s eight percent. As for women, Hunt's figure is 1.9 percent, compared to Kinsey *et al.*'s 3.6 percent (for post-pubescent females). Hunt believes this decline is genuine, and is due to the shrinkage in the proportion of the United States population living on farms. In the 1940 census, the farm population was 23.2 percent of the national population, while in the 1970 census, it was only 4.8 percent.

Eighty percent of the men who experienced animal contacts in the Hunt study started having them prior to age 15, and most of them terminated the behavior altogether, within a year of the first experience. The great majority of the women who had animal contacts had them between late childhood and age 21. Only a few individuals had any such contacts as adults. Hunt concludes and agrees with Kinsey *et al.* that the bulk of human-animal sexual relations is only a part of childhood and teen-age sexual experimentation, and is rarely an important phase of sexual life.

Seventy-five percent of the men in the Hunt study reported they had sexual relations with animals on six or fewer occasions, and over half of the men had such contacts during one year or less of their lives. Only one of the men had more than 20 sexual encounters with animals. Among the women, 67 percent had only one to three experiences, and only one out of eight had six or more. None of the women had had more than 20 sexual encounters with animals. Most women had their animal contacts within a single year of their lives, as is reported by Kinsey *et al.*.

A little over a third of the men who engaged in bestiality in the Hunt study had vaginal intercourse with an animal. Over a third had an animal lick or mouth their penises, and a similar number of men masturbated an animal or masturbated themselves by rubbing their genitals against the animal. Dogs were the chosen species in about half the sample, with farm animals somewhat less often as the sexual objects. The women in the Hunt study preferred household pets over barnyard animals, except that dogs were even more popular than in the Kinsey *et al.* study. Nearly all the women in the Hunt study, who had sex with animals, had the animal lick their genitals. Masturbating the animal and rubbing their genitals against the animal were the other principal techniques reported. There were no cases of vaginal intercourse between a male animal and a female human being in the Hunt study.

Monter (1981)

Originally published in 1974 in French, the author compares records of sodomy trials from the early modern era in two parts of French Switzerland — Geneva, a Protestant city, and Fribourg, a Catholic pastoral area. Each of these places recorded several dozen trials for “sodomy” between the 15th and 18th centuries. The author presents evidence that men charged with “sodomy” were prosecuted more often for homosexuality in cities, and more often for bestiality in rural areas. (For more information see **The Renaissance Period in Europe** in Chapter 2).

Zillmann, Bryant and Carveth (1981)

The authors conducted a study on 40 male undergraduates at the University of Massachusetts, who were randomly assigned to different conditions and tested individually. The study was designed to determine whether “aggressive cues” are involved in the aggression-facilitating effect of “disturbing erotica.” The participants were exposed to different visual stimuli, such as representations of nude females, bestiality, and sado-masochism. They were then provoked by a confederate to see how aggressively they would react.

Results showed that exposure to bestiality or sado-masochism proves disturbing for many young men, and that this exposure aggravates the provoked individual and thus promotes motivated aggression.

Davies (1982)

Davies compared a large number of Western societies and institutions, and found that the strong taboos that exist against homosexuality, bestiality, and transvestism in the West are the result of attempts to establish and defend strong ethnic, religious, or institutional boundaries. In places where such pressures are weak or absent, the taboos against these forms of sexual behaviors are also weak or absent.

Story (1982)

The author compared university students’ experience with various sexual behaviors, including bestiality, in 1974 and 1980. Fifty single men and 50 single women were randomly selected in 1974 and again in 1980, from students enrolled in a sexuality course at the University of Northern Iowa. The subjects answered a questionnaire requiring “yes” or “no” responses to 24 questions on their experience with various sexual behaviors.

The findings demonstrated, among others, that fewer students in 1980 than in 1974 reported any sexual contact with an animal. In 1974, 11 out of the 100 participants answered yes to the question “Have you ever had sexual contact with an animal?” while in 1980, only three participants answered positively. The author suggests that this seems to support the theory that “conservative society mores will curtail the number of students experiencing less socially acceptable sexual outlets even though the students do not profess to be conservative themselves” (p. 745).

Peretti and Rowan (1983)

Peretti and Rowan studied factors related to sustained practice of “chronic zoophilia.” Unfortunately, they neglected to distinguish between bestiality and zoophilia, and in fact, it appears that they studied “chronic” bestiality and not zoophilia, as is demonstrated in the study’s results.

The authors interviewed 27 men and 24 women between the ages of 17 and 28 years of age who confided about their sexual relations with animals to their primary care physicians. The data was gathered through a structured interview which was conducted by the same person to help eliminate interviewer bias. Only six variables were explored: sexual expressiveness, sexual fantasy, no negotiation, no human social involvement, economical, and emotional involvement.

For the men, sexual expressiveness was the most frequently given reply. The men, as well as the women, in this category considered their sexual relations with animals as only one form of possible sexual behavior. They maintained that this practice was the most convenient for them because it lacked the civilized pretense they had experienced in human sexual contact. The men further reported that sex with animals allowed them greater freedom in their sexual behaviors with much less difficulty in persuasion and performance as compared with human partners. Both the men and women stated that “zoophilia” was comparable to a form of masturbation; it was helpful during depressive periods or when they had no human sexual partner available. It

provided them with a level of pleasure hard to achieve in a conventional sexual manner, and it was helpful for married subjects in keeping them from seeking extramarital sexual experiences.

The men engaged in sexual fantasy (unrelated to bestiality) while engaging in sexual relations with animals more frequently than did the women (ranked second for the men and fifth for the women). Both the men and women maintained that they would almost always help arouse themselves and bring themselves to orgasm through sexual fantasies.

No negotiation ranked third for both men and women. They stated that the use of animals for sexual gratification was simple and straightforward without the need to bargain and play “mind games.”

No human social involvement (although not statistically significant at the .05 level) was important in sustaining “zoophilia” for both men and women. They reported they often wanted to engage in sexual behaviors without becoming involved in courtship, friendship or marriage. This they were able to do in their relationships with animals.

The men, more than the women, had significantly more responses regarding the economical aspects of bestiality. For them, human sexual relations tended to be associated with activities costing much more money as compared to the expenditures involved with bestiality. The women related that human sexual relations required they spend money for clothing, cosmetics, shoes and more.

For the women, emotional involvement was the most frequently given response of the six variables, while for the men it was the least frequent response. The women reported they tended to develop an attachment and affection for their animal sex partners, yet the authors de-emphasize their reports and explain these feelings as a common phenomenon of pet owners. They conclude that there is little reason to assume that the emotions and feelings people develop about animal companions are any less deep than those they develop toward other people as is demonstrated by the fact that people leave money to animals in their wills, bury them in cemeteries, and reorganize their lives so they can feed, clothe, mate, and exercise their animals.

Liliequist (1988)

Liliequist analyzed 1074 death penalties cases sentenced by the Superior Court Svea Hovratt in Sweden, based on letters from the court to the executive authorities between 1634 and 1756. He found that overall, far more individuals were executed for bestiality than for witchcraft in Sweden, totaling between 500 and 600 people. Many more animals, primarily cows, heifers, mares, sheep, goats, sows, bitches, and dogs, were also executed. Almost all convicted individuals were young men and adolescents males. (For more information see **The Renaissance Period in Europe** in Chapter 2).

Morris (1988)

Using legal records from the county of Somerset, England, between the years 1740 and 1850, the author examined alterations in popular attitudes toward and definitions of sodomy. During this time, 25 men from Somerset were charged with attempting or committing bestiality. Most of the men were young and came from small rural parishes. Of the 25 men, 18 were identified as laborers. The men’s sexual partners were common farm animals. Eight men (out of the 25) were found guilty (six of attempting bestiality and two of committing it).

The author points out that while the evidence for a link between sodomy and blackmail in Somerset existed, it did not for bestiality, although bestiality may have been equally damaging to the men’s reputation as homosexuality. The lack of blackmail in bestiality cases, the author suggests, may have resulted from the age and class of many of the offenders, which would have made them inappropriate targets for blackmail. (For more information see **Europe in the Modern Era and Today** in Chapter 2).

Cameron, Cameron and Proctor (1989)

The authors administered an extensive questionnaire of over 500 items to 4,340 heterosexual, bisexual, and homosexual adults in five metropolitan areas in the United States. Among other findings they discovered that bisexuals and homosexuals, as compared with heterosexuals, engaged in bestiality more frequently.

Leal (1989)

In an ethnographic dissertation on the gaucho population living on the border of Brazil and Uruguay, based on two years of fieldwork as well as on historical accounts, official statistics, and published folklore material, Leal provides an analysis of the gauchos' life style, which includes bestiality. The gauchos understand bestiality as a legitimate practice within a group where the dominant cultural belief consists of mastering the wild. A sexual relationship with certain animals is not only a sanctioned practice within this group, but is seen throughout south Brazil as a herdsmen's or rural tradition.

The author relates that the majority of adult men from pastoral regions, including urban areas, have experienced bestiality at least once in their lifetime. Most gauchos do not engage in this practice as a regular activity, though it is an important part of their customs. A few among them have "affairs" with animals, usually a mare, and usually the same animal on a regular basis.

For the gauchos, sexual relations with animals shows courage, and the wildest in the animal hierarchy is the most prestigious. The author further suggests that symbolically, by penetrating the mare, the men perceive themselves as having a stallion's phallus. (For more information see **South and Central America** in Chapter 2).

Alvarez and Freinhar (1991)

In this paper, the authors compared prevalence rates of bestiality between a sample of 20 (15 men and five women), randomly selected psychiatric in-patients and two demographically matched control groups — one control group consisted of 20 medical in-patients, and the other control group consisted of 20 people from the psychiatric staff. The authors developed a "Sexual Patterns Questionnaire" (SPQ) to assess the prevalence of bestiality. The SPQ consisted of responding to the following 10 questions with either "yes" or "no" answers:

- “ 1. I have had some type of sexual relations with a woman.
2. I have had some type of sexual fantasy about a woman.
3. I have had some type of sexual relations with a man.
4. I have had some type of sexual fantasy about a man.
5. I have had some type of sexual relations with an animal.
6. I have had some type of sexual fantasy about an animal.
7. I grew up in a city.
8. I grew up in the countryside.
9. I am male.
10. I am female” (p. 45).

The results show that six of the 15 psychiatric in-patients men had sex with animals. No one else, in any of the groups, had sexual relations with an animal. That means that 30 percent of the psychiatric in-patients group had sex with animals. Moreover, seven of the 15 psychiatric in-patients men, and two of the five psychiatric in-patients women fantasized about sexual relations with animals, which totals 45 percent of the whole psychiatric group. Three of the psychiatric in-patients who either had sex with animals or fantasized about it grew up in the countryside. Only two people in the medical in-patient group and three people in the staff group fantasized about sex with animals.

According to the authors, these results “clearly and unquestionably indicate a higher use of bestiality as a sexual outlet (both in fantasy and actuality) in psychiatric in-patients as compared” to either control groups (p. 46). The authors go further to conclude that a sexual interest in animals constitutes an important attribute of psychiatric patients.

Cerrone (1991)

To get an impression of the attitudes and beliefs of people who live in rural areas, regarding sex between humans and animals, the author interviewed 20 women who were students in his psychology class. Their reports revealed that sexual intercourse with sheep, goats, dogs, and chickens is more common than clinically reported. Moreover, Cerrone relates, “their reports illustrate a culturally ‘acceptable’ practice which may seem unusual or strange but which gets little attention in rural mental health clinics” (p. 31).

Penyak (1993)

In his Doctoral dissertation, Penyak attempted to understand the diverse social norms that existed in central Mexico from 1750 to 1850 by examining written and verbal expressions of sexuality, including bestiality. Chapter V of his dissertation describes the conduct of persons who engaged in homosexual, bestial, and solitary sexual activities, and society’s reactions to them. Penyak drew largely upon Inquisition and criminal documents at the Archivo General de la Nacion (Mexico) and the Archivo Judicial Tribunal Superior de Justicia (Mexico City). Confessional manuals stored at Mexico City’s Biblioteca Nacional provided further insight into sexual mores, since they contain personal questions that priests asked their penitents.

Although bestiality was considered a much more serious offense than masturbation, not one of the 33 men accused of bestiality during this period was put to death. Sentences usually ranged from three to 10 years of imprisonment, depending on the amount of time the accused had already spent in jail, and could include anything from forced military service and hard labor on public projects to prayers. The animals, however, were routinely destroyed. (For more information see **South and Central America** in Chapter 2).

Donofrio (1996)

In an unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Donofrio presents eight detailed sex histories that included human/animal sexual contact, gathered from six men and two women. The cases were drawn from a heterogeneous group of volunteers who had experienced sexual relations with animals. Notwithstanding the small number of case studies, this study is significant in that it focuses on people who have had sexual relations with animals, and it is a recent study.

The participants ranged in age from 20 to 54 years. All were Caucasian. Two of the participants have been active members of a Christian church, while the others indicated no current affiliations or worship activity. Two of the participants were in their first marriage, two were in a second marriage, two were divorced, and two have never been married. Five participants had children. Three grew up on farms, three in other rural areas, and three grew up in suburban communities. At the time of the study, seven resided in the suburbs, and only one participant lived in a rural area.

In each case included in this study, initial sexual contact with an animal was prompted by curiosity or sexual exploration, and recurred due to the resulting satisfaction. The author relates that the case histories presented in his study lead him to support the notion that human/animal sexual contact is not a clinically significant problem. Donofrio further reports that the concept of zoophilia being a sexual orientation was supported by his study.

SECTION II

MY OWN STUDY ON BESTIALITY/ZOOPHILIA

CHAPTER 5	FINDING SUBJECTS/PARTICIPANTS
CHAPTER 6	FOCUS GROUPS
CHAPTER 7	THE RESEARCH PROJECT
CHAPTER 8	GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PARTICIPANTS
CHAPTER 9	THE PARTICIPANTS' CHILDHOOD HISTORY
CHAPTER 10	THE PARTICIPANTS' SEXUAL HISTORY (Not Related to Bestiality/Zoophilia)
CHAPTER 11	PARTICIPANTS' CURRENT SEXUAL BEHAVIORS AND ATTITUDES (Not Related to Bestiality/Zoophilia)
CHAPTER 12	PARTICIPANTS' SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ANIMALS
CHAPTER 13	IS THERE A SEXUAL ORIENTATION TOWARD ANIMALS?
CHAPTER 14	LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY
CHAPTER 15	COMPARISONS WITH OTHER STUDIES
CHAPTER 16	A CLOSER LOOK AT SOME OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Conducting this extensive literature review, diminished any lingering doubts about the necessity for a study on bestiality and zoophilia. As the literature review reveals, scientific studies on the motivations for engaging in bestiality/zoophilia, and studies describing the sexual, social, and mental health profile of individuals involved, are very scarce. The few related studies described above (Kinsey *et al.*, 1948; Kinsey *et al.*, 1953; and Hunt, 1974) proved outdated and limited in their findings, since they did not focus on the issue of bestiality/zoophilia. Peretti and Rowan's study (1983) was more focused but did not distinguish between bestiality and zoophilia and only six variables were explored. Donofrio's more recent study (1996) focused on zoophiles, however, the small number of participants (8) limited his findings.

I found the major void of knowledge regarding bestiality/zoophilia alarming. In my opinion, clinical sexologists and psychotherapists, need to be equipped with a carefully researched base of knowledge in order to understand the phenomenon and the individuals involved. As professionals helping those who struggle with and experience ego-dystonic feelings about bestiality and zoophilia, it is important that this research be available and on-going.

To this end, I decided to conduct an exploratory study, in an attempt to gather data on a sexual behavior under-studied and misunderstood. I also wanted to better understand the people who engage in sexual relations with animals, and their motivations for doing so.

The idea that some people may be sexually attracted to animals, to the point of preferring animals to humans as sex partners, fascinated me. The new term, coined by the zoo community on the Internet:

“zoosexuality,” implies a sexual orientation toward animals. Stasya (1996), Tanka (1995), Shepherd (1996), and Fox (1994) on the Internet agreed with this definition. And Donofrio (1996) reports that the concept of zoophilia, being a sexual orientation, was supported by his doctoral study. He, therefore, suggests using a scale resembling Kinsey’s sexual orientation scale, which was also offered by Blake (1971). Donofrio’s model suggests that those who have no interest whatsoever in sexual contact with animals would appear at the Zero point of the scale. Those individuals whose sole sexual outlet and attraction are animals, would be assigned the Six position. Along that continuum, between these two extremes, would be individuals who include animal sexual contact in their fantasy, or have had incidental experiences with animals, have had more than incidental contact with animals, place their sexual activity with animals equal to that involving humans, prefer animal contact but engage in more than incidental contact with humans, and those who engage primarily in contact with animals with only incidental human sexual contact.

I therefore conceptualized my basic research question to be: “Is there a sexual orientation toward non-human animals?”

CHAPTER 5

FINDING SUBJECTS/PARTICIPANTS

While I was conducting the literature review, I started thinking about ways of finding participants for the study. I had no idea where to begin. I had my client, but that was definitely not enough. I started talking to anyone willing to listen. I placed an ad in *The Wild Animal Revue*. I posted an ad on a messages board at the Institute for Advanced Study for Human Sexuality in San Francisco, California. I sent a letter to Mark Matthews the founder of the Zoophilic Outreach Organization and talked to him on the telephone. I placed ads in *Sexual Science*, the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality newsletter and in *Contemporary Sexuality*, the American Association for Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists (AASECT) newsletter. Most importantly, I posted an ad on the Internet at alt.sex.bestiality bulletin board.

When I went to the AASECT's annual meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, in June of 1996, I posted an ad on the messages board. A prominent figure in the sexology field (from another organization) was offended by the ad and ordered it down. This sad incident, however, ended on a positive note: The president of AASECT at that time, Dr. Judy Seifer, formally apologized and became one of my doctoral advisors. Also, before the ad was taken down, it was photographed by a journalist and ended up in the *Baltimore City Paper's* June 19, 1996 issue, as part of an article by Motoyama, about the above conference.

All the ads had the same message:

"I need volunteers... Anyone who has ever had sexual relations with an animal... To fill out an anonymous questionnaire.

I am a doctoral student who is doing her dissertation research on bestiality/zoophilia. I believe this topic is understudied and that it is important to shed some light on this phenomenon. This will be especially significant for people who struggle with this issue and for their psychotherapists.

Please call me at 202-659-4938 weekdays and ask for Hani. I appreciate any help I can get. Thanks!"

One day I received a phone call from a woman, I'll call her Beverly. She told me she heard about me and my study from a friend on the Internet and she would like to help. I was elated. We had about a 10 minute conversation, and I was very impressed. She was divorced, had a daughter and a boyfriend. She sounded very intelligent. And she was a zoo. She also told me she has many connections with the zoo community, and she will ask everyone to give me a call. I could hardly contain my excitement.

The next day I got a phone call from a man, I'll call him Jim. Jim was a realtor and a close friend of Beverly. They lived about 20 minutes away from each other. We talked for about an hour. He sounded like a really nice, smart guy, and I enjoyed our conversation very much. Then Ted called. He was a Biologist and a friend of Jim. He was a zoo too, and I was in heaven. Soon I had about 20 names and addresses of zoos who volunteered to participate in the study.

I then met with Beverly for lunch. She came with her daughter so we could not talk about my study, but we talked about everything else. I really liked her. Since I did not have access to the Internet at that time, she offered to come with her boyfriend to my place with a lap top and connect me to the Internet on their account. Her boyfriend was a very handsome man, in his 30s. He was divorced, a Government employee with a Top Secret clearance, and a zoo. On a cold November night in 1995, I logged on the Internet for the first time in my life, and into a chat room where a whole crowd of zoos was waiting to speak with me.

I was amazed at the sense of friendship and closeness the zoos exhibited among themselves. Most had Internet names of animals, and they acted as though they were animals playing with other animals, like a litter of cubs would play with each other. They were playful, friendly and respectful to one another. They were organized with a moderator and specific rules about how to run this meeting. It appeared as though meeting me

was very important to the zoos. My anxiety about using the Internet for the first time, and being in a chat room with zoos and potential volunteers for my study, soon dissipated. The people I met there were welcoming, and seemed eager to get to know me and to ask questions.

Their questions were intelligent and straight forward. They wanted to know what was the purpose of the study? Where were my subjects going to come from other than the Internet? What questions were going to be in the lengthy questionnaire? What was I hoping to contribute to the psychological community by doing this study? What prompted me to do this research? What specific research question was I trying to answer? How was I going to address the bias that the zoos on the Internet are just a subset of the total zoo community? What were my current beliefs about zoophilia? Were the questionnaires going to be given to non-zoos for comparison? Will the questions be qualitative or quantitative? What statistical method of tabulations was I going to use? Was my school accredited? ...

Some gave me suggestions about what to ask in the questionnaire and how to go about doing this study. Others were very suspicious, almost paranoid; was I “zoo friendly” or was I an FBI agent? Why was I asking for their mailing address? What would I do with the mailing list? What about the legality of sending the complete questionnaires across state lines, and from other countries? How was I going to ensure confidentiality? And what about anonymity? ...

I really enjoyed this and did not want it to end. Four hours went by and I did not even notice. I was ecstatic. (Excerpts of what transpired in the chat room are in Appendix I).

I never expected what happened next: zoos started calling me from all over the world. When I set up to do this study, I expected, at most, to end up with a few brave zoos, and conduct a case-study kind of research. However, more than 160 people contacted me about the study (three heard about me through the *Baltimore City Paper*), and most of them were very supportive and encouraging. They congratulated me on the idea to conduct a study about them, and expressed excitement about taking part in this research project. Some of them began advocating for me and getting their zoo friends to join the study. One zoo, Stasya, devoted his web-page to discuss and advocate my study and provided information about how to contact me. After a while, the news about my study spread through the zoo community, and my subject population began to take form.

Some of the zoos who contacted me by telephone, began calling me on a regular basis, just to chat. I welcomed these advances since I wanted to develop good relationships with them and hopefully get more subjects for my study through them. But, more importantly, I enjoyed talking to them and found them to be very interesting. I was fascinated with their stories and often with their wisdom. When their annual gathering took place, they invited me.

I was very flattered. Now I knew they trusted me. But, I had mixed feelings; I did not want to get too close to them; people might think I am a zoo and/or their friend and not take my study seriously. At the same time, how could I give up an opportunity like this? I decided to go. This turned out to be a profound weekend. It opened the doors to a secret world populated by entertaining, intelligent people, engaged in a sexual behavior that much of our contemporary society views with revulsion. “Living outside the pale,” they welcomed me into their gathering. As a researcher, they shared themselves with only the expectation that I would one day objectively report my findings to the greater population.

Beverly came to pick me up at the airport with three other zoos, and after a stop at her house, we went to Jim’s, where the gathering took place. Jim’s house was located in a rural area. He had a couple of horses, a donkey, two llamas, and a few dogs. I met more than fifty zoos from all around the country. Some of them came with their partners, and everywhere I turned there were big dogs laying around. Everyone was nice and polite. People were supportive and cooperative (after they were assured about confidentiality, about my intentions, and that I am not a zoo). I found myself in the company of some interesting and friendly people. We spent the weekend talking about zoophilia and other general topics. We watched (main-stream) movies, played cards and other games, went for walks, cooked and laughed together. When I returned home, I had a long list of new volunteers for my study and I was much more educated about zoophilia and zoophiles.

CHAPTER 6

FOCUS GROUPS

While I was at the gathering, in May of 1996, I took the opportunity to conduct two focus-groups. In a focus group, participants engage in an open discussion about a specific topic, in this case — bestiality and zoophilia. It is sort of a brain-storming process, which I used to get ideas for what to ask in my questionnaire. The first group met for an hour and included 13 men. The second group met for an hour and a half and included 11 men and one woman. Every participant signed a consent form allowing me to tape the discussion and use their comments, anonymously in my book.

The discussions began with defining bestiality and zoophilia. Even among the zoos, there were variations on the definitions, although all agreed there were differences between bestiality and zoophilia. They provided illustrations and examples to clarify their points, joked around, and overall seemed to enjoy discussing these topics openly.

Some of the groups' participants related how difficult it was to be a zoo, to find other zoos, and to come out to their family members and friends. Others complained about the fact that the media made zoos look like perverts, child molesters, and rapists. They were terrified of being outed or caught. On the other hand, the zoos were elated about the advancement of the Internet which allowed them to realize they were not alone, and to form a supportive community. Other zoos mentioned the endless parallels between zoophiles and homosexuals in American society.

They discussed the issue of animal consent and how they knew when the animal wanted to have sex with them. They related their experiences at the hands of psychotherapists, and described the worst thing about being zoos — having to out-live their sex partners. One of the participants began crying as he related losing his animal sex partner. The members of his group rushed to hug and support him.

Many other issues were touched on during these two focus groups. I combined most of their comments into one transcript, and would like to share it with you, so that you get a flavor of the way these zoos think and the issues that are on their minds —

I started the discussion by asking: “What do you think is bestiality? What is zoophilia? Is there a difference between them? And what is the difference, if there is one?”

— “I think there is definitely a difference between bestiality and zoophilia... Zoophiles are more emotionally attached to their animals than a bestialist would be. A zoophile might regard the animal that they're with as their significant other. A bestialist might keep that animal as a companion, take very good care of them, but not hold them in the same emotional sense as a zoophile would.”

— “I would say that bestiality refers to the act, any act regardless of circumstance. Zoophilia is everything beyond the act — the thoughts, many feelings, decisions on whether to do such things. Zoophilia describes a person; bestiality describes an act.”

— “I'd say it's the difference between having a caring relationship and just using the animal for gratification. The bestialists, from my point of view, just basically use the animal for sexual relief... They may take care of it and that... but he's treating it as... a sex toy. You get just as much out of it as out of what you would, as using a doll or going and seeing a prostitute. Whereas a zoophile relationship is more. It's a marriage, in every sense of the term.”

— “... My dog, when he wants sex, I will masturbate him, and that's as far as it goes... I'm not like a big sex hound or anything like that. If my dog, when my dog really wants sex, then I'll give him that satisfaction, but it's, my relationship with him is love-based. It's love emotions, being with him, just being able to cuddle up next to him, fuzzy his belly, just hearing any noises he can make, or a cute look. Everything about him. I'm in love with every part of his body, every action he's ever done...”

— “...the dog was what made me realize that I really enjoyed giving him pleasure. Giving pleasure, not necessarily as a submissive act, but sometimes, but the giving of pleasure I believe is a true, one of the true marks of a zoophile, and that we enjoy making them happy. We enjoy giving them sexual pleasure, we enjoy giving them sensual pleasure through grooming and stuff, and we enjoy, you know, giving them the companionship that they would need if they were in like a pack situation or a herd situation... Through being near them and being associated with them in that way, we can fill their needs, and being able to do that is really a great privilege and pleasure.”

— “...What’s the difference between a person making love and when is a person just having sex? Even among zoophiles it’s quite possible to have sex without making love, and so it’s pretty difficult to pinpoint where zoophilia ends and someone that’s just creating bestiality, the sexual act. The only thing that can ever define that is that person’s own feelings.”

— “Right, cause there are some people who are zoophiles, like myself, who occasionally have flings, or have intercourse with creatures that they may have not met before or haven’t gotten to know.”

— “These are artificial definitions. There are divisions within the community. People want to separate themselves. One thing I just want to separate from is animal abuse. Okay? Zoophiles generally want nothing to do with that... Most of us here I’m sure would define ourselves as zoo. How many of you have fence hopped? Are you less a zoo? Are you now a bestialist because you’ve fence hopped?”

At this point I had to ask: “what’s ‘fence hopped’?”

— “Jumped over the fence at night to go...”

— “It’s not like you can go to a farmer’s door and say, ‘I’d like to take your mare out on a date’” (laughter).

— “...The zoophile thing is kind of a gradual process. When you’re an adolescent, your hormones are raging... and the emotional content just developed over time.”

— “It sounds just like anyone else, though, I mean your normal, average heterosexual junior high or high school student when they’re all together.”

— “I don’t feel that zoophilia has to involve sex though. Like with my dog, I mean, I consider myself a zoo, but I really don’t have sex with my dog. I love him more than anything in the universe, and I consider him to be my lover, and we’re companions. I’d do anything in the world for him... He’s just everything in my life, so that’s how I feel... Masturbation is all it comes to, and the only time that I would ever masturbate him is when he would initiate it... The sexual part isn’t really part of my feelings; it’s something he wants, and he’s the one who always initiates it. And I really don’t see that as my main focus of being a zoo...”

— “I think what we’re seeing is an effort to kind of define ourselves. Now that we know that there is a group of us out here, which a lot of us started three or four years ago... now there’s a struggle to come up with some sort of nomenclature...”

— “... The greatest word to come along in a while, to be coined in a while, is ‘zoosexual,’ because it takes all these arguments and tosses them out the window...”

— “Every piece on the continuum is contained within zoosexual.”

— “It’s a lifestyle.”

— “Part of the problem also is that... zoophiles are, the distribution of zoophiles is a perfect cross-section of the entire world, or at least the country. There are zoophiles from every walk of life...”

— “That does bring up one other point: that most zoos, at least in my own case, and I’m sure a lot of others, you tend to think of yourself as a real pervert because... It’s next to impossible to find others. All of us here have been extremely fortunate in finding an entire group of people just like ourselves (through the

Internet). I really hate to think of how many people go through their entire lives without so much as ever realizing that there are others.”

— “It’s a really good feeling to find others... For a long time it was like, well, I have feelings, I’m not sure how to deal with them, and then I read part of a book. It’s like, ‘Wow, there must be other people out there.’ But then I was presented with the problem: I have no way of contacting them. Because it’s not like you can wear a little button that says, ‘Hi, I’m a zoophile’ you know... (laughter). So, through the Internet... you can get together with people and then talk for a while and realize that you’re not alone, and it’s very comforting... It’s very scary thinking how many people live their lives, or even lose their lives because they can’t deal with being a zoo. Cause that happens a lot with homosexuals and not being able to deal with being a zoo could result in the same thing... It’s a hard time. It’s kind of a rough trip to come to terms with this sexuality. It’s not easy, and then all the stuff that we have to put up with from society, and just living in a closet where you can’t really come out to too many people, I mean, you’re lucky if you can come out to your friends...”

— “It can be an incredible life-changing experience... when you first read about other people who are like you, when you first talk to them online, when you first talk to them on the phone, when you first talk to them in real life... You’re real! You’re really there! You really are like me! It’s an amazing revelation...”

— “... Luckily, because of the Internet... you meet people and realize that it’s really not a disorder. It’s just a way of life. It’s good to know that.”

— “Exactly. Finding out that there were other zoos and speaking with others randomly, some of the most unscrewed up people I’ve met in my life...”

— “... There have been a number of, a huge number of new people, who’ve found out...”

— “Around 700.”

— “... (name of a person) is a gentleman who has put up a Web page that deals with zoophilia and related issues and has some stories and facts, frequently asked questions...”

— “Web page is much easier to access...”

— “You don’t have to talk to anyone, it’s just there. I had one set up as well, and it had, on the average, 200 hits a day from all over the world.”

— “... (name of a person) got so many (hits) that he had to take the counter off. The hits to his page were taking up 60 percent of the T-1 line.”

— “I think he said 10,000...”

— “Apparently a tremendous amount of interest out there, whether it’s all voyeuristic people wanting to get their rocks off, or get slicked out or, get grossed out by it... But intermingled in the big chunk of people that are, that don’t know what it is, and see a casual reference someplace and go look, there are always going to be a few people that are very serious about it, like us, that actually are willing to go out and talk to someone or kind of hang out in the shadows a little bit for a while, read a news group for a while, then get up a little more courage and get on a talker and start talking to a few people there, and then eventually come here and hang with us weirdos.”

— “Yeah, I’m sure for every one of us that’s willing to come to a group like this, there’s probably 40 who would never do it...”

— “You have a lot to lose... if there were really some kind of police set-up, or blackmail. There are so many things that can go wrong... if you think about how many people could have their careers destroyed...”

— “...when you think about the Net, there’s kind of an illusion which I bought into for a while. ‘Cause when I got on the Net two years ago, the Net seemed very different then, and people seemed a lot smarter. But as AOL and Net access becomes easier and more, and you don’t have to be smart or a computer whiz to get on line anymore, we’re really beginning to see that it is a whole cross-section of the population, that it (bestiality) isn’t just a phenomenon of smart people or computer geeks or anything like that... And I’m discovering it’s

almost disappointing to have this illusion destroyed, that maybe we're all smarter, or a little more creative, but the more I talk to, the more zoos I meet online, the more I discover that we're just people, and run the gamut of what people are like."

— "Yeah, we were getting a skewed sampling. You know... a few years ago, everyone on the Internet ... had to be a smart person. You had to know about computers and everything... I was convinced that zoophiles had a marked tendency to be on the upper scale of intelligence..."

— "... I know two blacks and three Asians, and all of them like to keep quiet."

— "Drawing parallels with the gay community... the very first time on there (a chat room called "bearish demons") I met a black bear person, and I asked, 'well, how come there's so few black bears?' and they said, 'Oh, there's plenty of black bears, they just don't talk to you.' 'And why not?' 'Well, because you're white.' And so there's an overlying tendency among ethnic groups to not mix... So, it's possible that there are blacks out there, but... they may feel so alienated that... they're a zoo and we're zoos, but they still can't relate to us."

— "It's interesting, cause I've gotten to know five African-American zoos because everybody thinks my Net name, Black..., (means) I'm an African-American... so I hear from more African-Americans."

— "I get a similar thing, because of the Net name I chose, It's an obviously very ethnic-sounding, very black name... so I get a lot of black people..."

— "...I think there's almost an equal number of women, they're just much quieter" (on the Internet).

— "... I think that by and large the case with any woman admitting to any sexual outlet, in our society they're treated far more harshly by people than males are. They're not going to fess up to it. They tend to be far more closeted and less willing or able to talk about it than males are."

— "And being that most of us have known each other through the Net..., basically there just aren't that many women out there... a lot of women get on the Net... and then they get scared off... It is extremely common on the Net for people to... ask 'I want to watch a woman do it with an animal.' It's so common, it's boring... I know that I get really offended and really bothered... 'Well, I'll call you if there's an animal that's really sexy...' None of your damn business!! Because they assume that anyone who would do that with an animal has no problem being degraded."

— "There are more women appearing on the net, and thus are coming to these gatherings — there are some here. For example, there's Goldie, who's not a zoo at all, but just likes hanging around us cause she thinks we're cool..."

— "But there's still a lot of women who are there and they don't feel comfortable talking about it...people will talk in chat mode, but they (women zoos) won't talk in public. They have to be more cautious, and rightly so, because there are a lot of horny males out there online — 60% droolers and jerks..."

— "There are a lot more (women zoos) out there than the sample (the people in the gathering) will indicate. More of us confirm that just from personal e-mail."

— The woman participant said: "... Women drop in (on the Internet) and then they drop back out again. And I think that it's more about that women don't go around talkin' about their sexuality, and about the sex that they have... Most of you guys know no personal, intimate details about my sex life, because I don't share..."

— "...we think there are a lot more women out there, maybe housewives who get into things with their family pets, that people don't know about... I think there are a lot of in-the-closet zoo people who are out there, and thinking about the people that don't use the Internet, or never will use the Internet — there's probably many that we will never know of, because this is so taboo."

— "...we need confirmed studies... something where research has been done... We've got to be able to say, 'it's accepted, it exists, and it's real.' And it's not just us trying to fool ourselves... And another thing that's a common thread that I've seen, this is, we're one of the only groups I've ever seen, as a group, that

adamantly refuses to recruit. We don't reach enough people. I have actually gone out of my way to discourage people. If I get the feeling it's just a sexual (fantasy), I will flat out tell them, 'Go buy yourself a sex doll. Go hire a prostitute.' ...You know, slam bam, thank you. And... if I get that feeling from somebody, I'll discourage them, because it's not what it's all about. There's more to it than that. It's commitment. It's a worse commitment than a marriage because you can't walk away. They don't understand if you leave them."

— "...and this has been tough for me, because I know I'm going back after a week and a half to dogs that aren't used to seeing me gone... It's been three years since I've taken a vacation of a week. Other than that, we've been together almost constantly."

— "I've never been separated from my love for a day.."

— "It is certainly worth mentioning that there are just endless numbers of parallels between zoophilia in American society and homosexuals in American society... We are following exactly the same path, footstep for footstep, of gays, except that we're farther behind... Well, there are stereotypes... you go back a few decades, all gays were drag queens..."

— "Child molesters."

— "Yeah, there you go, child molesters. I can remember in my childhood in the 70s, I remember reading in Ann Landers: 'I just found out my babysitter is lesbian. Should I fear for my kids' safety?' And certainly, it may be hard for someone who's known us to believe it, but people hear about someone who does things like this and they..."

— "For some reason, the image that stereotype... I seem to hear most often is the notion of a person raping a goat. I don't know what it is about a goat... For some reason people imagine this drooling maniac, clambering after a fleeing goat..."

— "Along the line of stereotypes... non-zoos online... immediately assume that because I'm male that I'm a heterosexual zoo. So that if you're male either you're just out there shagging sheep or goats. And I have had a lot of goats... and it completely escapes them that maybe possibly... that we're the one in the passive role in this."

— "A lot of people will say how can you abuse an animal? I mean, an animal doesn't have a choice when you're doing it. Well, getting into the gory details, when I bend over and he goes, he jumps up, it's like... I'm not holding a gun going, 'you gotta do this'" (laughter).

— "People will say, 'Yeah, but you're taking advantage of that poor creature. It's just instinct.' And I've yet to have an opportunity to use this reply: What exactly would you call it when human beings do it? It's instinct."

— "...the only thing that I had heard, that was suggested to me during an argument with a non-zoo was that, 'Well, you've obviously perverted the animal for the animal to have any interest in you at all.' And... the individual said the animal should be put down."

— "I can vouch for the donkey's virtue!" (Laughter).

— "The ignorance that goes with some of this, this is one thing I would be so bold as to say, exceeds what goes on with the attitudes toward gays. Because the ignorance... in common attitudes towards zoophilia is funny..."

— "Occasionally we still will get scolded in the Internet by someone who's saying 'You, crazy people! Don't you realize that, what kind of monstrous mutant creature can come of such an unholy union?'" (laughter).

— "You go back and break it down into chromosome number and genetics, and say, 'Now if any of us could have had a baby of that nature, we would now be fantastically wealthy and starring on many TV shows.'"

— "We wouldn't have time — we'd have so many kids!" (laughter).

— "...it's (having sex with animals) not usual, but it is natural."

— “It’s like saying albinism isn’t natural. It’s unusual to happen in a lot of species, but it does happen occasionally.”

— “...the presentation of bestiality in the media tends to, be always very light-hearted or, you know, humorous in nature.”

— “I think that one of the reasons for that is because nobody really believes that anybody with any mind at all actually does this. Frequently we see the same thing; people get on the Net (and say): ‘Are you guys for real? Are you really doing this? I thought it was just a joke.’”

— “You get it many times... They’ll either say, ‘Got any pictures?’ or they’ll say, ‘Wow, this is really weird.’ Or they’ll say, ‘You guys are all sick!’”

— “... We’ve become the ultimate fantasy for some people, we’re comic relief for some people, and some of us are really tired of it. We want to be recognized as a legitimate sexual orientation. That’s what we are.”

— “...the only time I’ve ever seen anything presented in the media has been whenever somebody gets in trouble. And it is always the rapists who get it — the animal rapers... It is the ones who abuse the animal... that are most frequently... who get caught, and who people are hearing about...”

— “Without exception... the media will always use the words... ‘sexually assaulted the animal.’ Always, every single time.”

— “... a zoophile is painted as a bestialist who will eventually become something like a rapist. Will go out and shoot people at McDonald’s, a pedophile. Because they’re always coming up with studies that say this person just shot 20 people at the local McDonald’s, used to be a bestialist. Or you know, he’s a pedophile, he started out with animals for sexual gratification...”

— “Another thing to think about too is groups such as the Humane Society, the SPCA, PETA. Dealing with them, they’d probably like nothing better than to see our heads in a fish tank, or on a platter...”

— “Their goal is to turn the entire United States and get laws passed that require every personally owned pet to be castrated. Literally. That’s their stated goal...”

— “...There’s another aspect of that too, that’s not uncommon for the Humane Society... In the interest of the animal, they will say, ‘The animal has learned to have sex with a human. It can never be rehabilitated as a house pet.’ So they kill it. Pure and simple, they kill it.”

— “I think there’s also another aspect to it, where it’s viewed as a little bit more acceptable. It’s, oh one of those things that adolescents do, and then you grow out of it. And it’s okay when you’re young, but then, as you get older, suddenly you become a social menace... I remember waiting through the years I was 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, until I was going to grow out of this phase I was in” (laughter).

— “... Well, I don’t know what’s wrong with Kinsey’s study, but it’s the only study I know of...”

— “Yeah, Kinsey, that was the part that they had a problem with, because that’s how he got his data, from interviewing child molesters.”

— “... Whenever you see an article about the problems and evils of the Internet, what do they always talk about?”

— “Bestiality and pedophiles.”

— “...one observation I’ve made is that we consider our animal partners mature adults, which says that it’s contact between adults... Basically, pedophilia is abhorrent, if not more so than it is to the average person, because of the immaturity involved.”

— “... My two horses, for example, I have tried to do... things sexually with them that they did not like, and they told me they didn’t like it. I mean... their ears went back, you know, they were uncomfortable, they fidgeted. Basically, what I’m trying to say is, I tried to be a top with both my horses. My horses don’t care

for that... There was a time, years ago, I would admit that I would have just gone ahead with it any ways. The older I got, the more mature and more acceptance I got in what my lifestyle is, I was very sensitive. I became more sensitive to my animal lovers' needs... I didn't try to do anything, I never tried to do anything to my animals that I'd feel harmed them in any way..."

— "Also, the dog has the ultimate way to say no, and that's two rows of very sharp teeth..."

— "...(when) they're not interested, and it takes an understanding person to not proceed then. Cause anyone could proceed, you know... exert enough force on the animal, but that'd be a bestialist. A zoo would see that the animal did not want to continue and stop. And that's, that can be frustrating, cause you're all excited, but it really takes a strong person to say, 'Okay, the animal says no,' and if they did continue it would be rape.

— "...the fact that if the animal is really feeling strong(ly) about it, they'll be more than merely indicative that they're not overly interested. There's always the matter of, as you say, with a dog, two rows of rather sharp teeth. Horse has a good, a healthy set of choppers and mighty sharp hooves, not to mention it outmatches you by at least four to one, 400 pounds, you know... I got kicked in the thigh by a ... gelding... If I'd put my head down, he would have clocked me right in the noggin, and I would have been brain damaged. Yeah, yeah, I would have been toast..."

I asked what's the difference between kids and animals when it comes to sex.

— "Kids are not mature."

— "... For me, it's dealing with a, literally dealing with a mature adult of another species who is my equal. I don't view an animal as inferior, or me as superior to him... And a kid, any immature adult, be it a kid, an (immature) animal, the mental equipment, the nerve paths, whatever you want to call it, they aren't well enough formed to make... a good decision..."

— "I agree that animals are, I see an animal as my equal..."

— "...how can you sexually consider a child to be an informed equal? ...if they are not capable of making what has been called an informed decision, then, no, they should not be involved in any way whatsoever. Whether they're four or 40."

— "...back to the Humane Society thing, they like to consider animals as children, for some strange, ungodly reason..."

— "As soon as they say that, then we get all flustered... because it's very difficult to express the fact that children are children, and animals are fucking not kids! Okay? They're not human beings... And people who do make the, and do try and draw an equality there, first of all, it's really, it's offensive in a way that, I consider that to be demeaning to the animal, because that's like saying that it, equating a horse, a stallion, like... who's a lover of mine, equating him with some kid who doesn't know what the heck is going on..."

— "Well, if we also remember, the one reason... to equate animals as children, children make a wonderful political tool, media weapon..."

— "The Humane Society's going to compare animals to children ...I'd like to see how the... Humane Society would feel about people eating children" (laughter).

— "...I guess I've gotten a lot more bitter, the longer I've been a vegetarian. I don't know, but it's like I, when I see a person eating meat, it's like, not that it just could be my lover, but that was a conscious being that could react the same way we've all been talking about, and experienced love..."

— "... it goes back to the assumption that people who have sex with animals are these drooling, mentally, light-hearted people who are idiots and things, no self-control. I was having lunch with a friend of mine and I'm talking about how I'd like to get a job in a horse stable that was in town, and he said, 'Well, are you planning on telling the owner that you have sex with animals?' And I said, 'Well, no!' And he goes,

‘Well, you have to!’ And I said, ‘Why?’ And he goes, ‘Just warn him that you’re having sex with his animals.’ And I said, ‘What makes you think I’m going to have sex with his animals?’”

— “...there are plenty of male gynecologists in the world who have female patients... I got fired from my last job in an animal hospital because I was a zoophile. The only sheep that I touched was to put Betadine on it, for its surgery. Never did anything sexual to an animal there. And I lost my job because of my sexuality, though I never did anything sexually related.”

— “There’s also that whole other issue of, you may be in a stable or other situation with lots of animals around. That doesn’t mean that every one of them is attractive to you. I see dogs running all over the place, and there are a lot of them that I’m attracted to, but a lot of them are not...”

— “... I’m living as an exclusive zoo, my God, almost all my life. As far as explaining, I’ve already outed myself to my sister, and my God, she sat down and smoked four cigarettes, chain-smoked them. I was like just shaking that whole night. But she understood and said she still loved me, but never to tell my parents. Hani, I made the horrible mistake of printing that article talking about you, asking for volunteers, and lo and behold I was visiting ... and they (my parents) came to clean my house and found it.”

— “Holy shit!”

— “I’d hate to think what would happen if somebody got into my computer.”

— “... My friend was very lucky... He had a psychiatrist tell the judge there’s nothing wrong with it (with having sex with animals)... He only got off with probation, but he got hours of community time, he lost his Federal job, his horse, and his career was destroyed.”

— “I ... had therapy when I was 14. I initially got caught when I was 14. I went through the court system as a juvenile and was put on probation... I ran away from home after getting caught having sex with a couple different German Shepherds. And the therapist... was absolutely non-judgmental... We worked on the issues of why... It was a very positive experience. And then I had another experience, when I was about 20, with another therapist who had a completely different paradigm in mind... It was an addiction paradigm... and I had a really hard time trying to apply that to myself... He thought I should categorize myself in this. I could understand the dynamics of, you’re into zoophilia, it’s pretty easy to feel isolated, and perhaps you can use the sex as a way of medicating yourself, but I just couldn’t. There was no reason. I had a dog, I already had a very intense emotional bond, and he was like, ‘You’ve got to get rid of your dog.’ And I was like, ‘No way. I’m not getting rid of my dog.’”

— “I did therapy when I was early teens... I had started talking about suicide one morning, and it helped out... There was about 20 years or so where basically I dealt with the guilt feelings I was having by suppressing most of my emotions, and finding people (on the Internet) to talk to was what allowed me to open up the guilt, to feel safe to deal emotionally with (my zoophilia)”

“What was your psychiatrist’s reaction?”

— “I never told him. I didn’t feel safe to tell him. (We talked about) a lot of other things, but I didn’t feel safe to tell him (about my zoophilia).”

— (The woman participant said): “I told my shrink just a couple of weeks ago actually, and in the context of talking about my (human) partner... At the end of it (the conversation), I had to say, ‘Wait a minute. I just told you that I have sex with animals, and you just... it just kind of rolled right along.’ And she said, ‘Is this a problem for you?’ And I said, ‘No.’ And she said, ‘How long have you been coming here?’ And I said, ‘Way too long’ (laughter). And she said, ‘I know you well enough to know that if this was a problem for you, you would have brought it up long ago...’ And that’s the last I’ve ever heard of it...”

— “...I was talking with one (therapist)... and the first thing he wanted to do was lock me up for about a week for observation... I know of at least three people... who have been locked up, treated to electroshock therapy, drug therapy, and all that, just because they admitted that yes, they were a zoo...”

— “The one time I saw a therapist about it... his whole reaction was, ‘You should be locked up and will stay that way.’ I got up off the couch after that statement, walked out, and... personally I would not be tremendously unhappy to see that he had lost his license...”

I asked if they thought zoophilia and/or bestiality were perversions.

— “... Do I think it’s a perversion, or right or wrong, or anything like that? I don’t think that it’s wrong, but what’s more, it really doesn’t matter. I’ve come to the conclusion that it’s Okay to have certain desires, but what is important is how you handle them...”

— “So perhaps the question might be rephrased in terms of not perversion per se, but... does it produce worries, doubts, or guilt within you?”

— “Is it morally wrong? If it were morally wrong, we wouldn’t be here.”

— “...if you’re comfortable with your sexuality, and it’s not damaging to your partner, and society, then there really shouldn’t be anything wrong with it. I hope that’s how modern-day psychologists see it, is that you’re not hurting your partner. If you’re a bestialist, that’s debatable, but if you’re a zoo, you’re not going to hurt your partner, and it’s not going to hurt society if they don’t get out their camcorders and look through the window and get offended by it.”

— “In my case, my folks had a book, a textbook on human sexuality in a bookcase when I was growing up. And since the day I found that book and read about zoophilia, I wasn’t doing anything at that time, but I said, ‘Whoa, Okay.’ And I like Greek myths, I thought they were pretty cool, and I knew what my inclination was at that point, and I’d never really had any problem with it.”

— “I’ve come to the conclusion with my own self that I’m capable of responding to many different stimuli in an erotic manner, and that to apply this sort of morality, some sort of construct of our society to that, these natural feelings that I have, I just can’t do that anymore.”

— “When I was growing up, as a teenager, I was lucky enough: my parents had a copy of Kinsey’s report in the house and I looked through it and found references to bestiality and I thought, ‘Okay, I’m not alone.’ And that was a great help towards dealing with the feelings I was having. I’d often sat down and analyzed — is what I’m doing wrong? You know, if you follow the biblical interpretation in Leviticus, any person who lays with an animal shall be stoned and the animal put to death as well, which I thought was grossly unfair to the animal.”

— “... From my standpoint, I don’t see how anything I do with an animal that causes the animal enjoyment or pleasure could be construed as wrong. And I see lots of people who think nothing of eating an egg from a chicken that’s been confined to a one-foot cage with four other chickens its whole life, and that’s not cruelty to animals, but when I insert my genitalia into the animal’s genitalia, or vice versa, or however you want to look at it, then that suddenly is an evil thing. And I don’t understand... it’s Okay to kill animals, cause them pain, do whatever you want to so you get the desired result from them, whether it’s pulling a cart, or providing you with food, but it’s not Okay to have mutually pleasurable sexual relations.”

I asked if they would want to change and not be zoophiles.

— “I don’t know what it is not to be a zoophile, so I really couldn’t say yes or no.”

— “Yeah, if I could have from the start not been one, I think I would have rather not been one. But would I choose to change from a zoo into a non-zoo? No.”

— “Yes, actually I would. This is probably going to come as a shock. I would because facing what I am, and dealing with it and learning to live with it, and I’ve been in (the) position, I have also sat there and worried if it wouldn’t be better just to end it. It’s caused me no end of pain... I would do it, change it because, to be honest... I’ve been dealing with my zoophilia... since I was about 14. I didn’t have a word for it until I

was 25. I know something was different. But this has caused me more pain in my life, and I've never been able to come to grips with it. And I'm still, to this day, fighting it and suffering a lot of pain for it..."

— "...if I had been given the opportunity I, in fact I lost two opportunities when I was about 24, due to my own inexperience with a woman... (For example), we were at a party and she asked me, 'Am I your girlfriend?' And being the dumb, inexperienced fool that I was, I said... I was honest and said, 'I don't own anybody. That's your decision if you want to be with me.' Six months later she wound up marrying the man that she was talking about, that wanted to know this. It was really her asking if I wanted a permanent relationship, but I didn't know it until years later... So I would have changed for them (the two women/opportunities), but now, and considering where it's led me, I won't, you know, don't look back. I've been comfortable with it."

— "... For me, I wouldn't have changed. I'm 23 and I would have never changed... I'm really at a crossroads in my life... because I have a female friend who would marry me in a second, but, you know, for all the difficulty that it causes, I wouldn't trade my relationship (with animals) for anything, because it's that rich, and it's, it makes me feel that complete to have it."

— "The bonds we have with animals are really unique... It's not the same as you could get from a person. I'm married, and I would never change that... But, as it is, being a zoo is really important to me, that the feelings that I get when I'm around horses are incredible, and I'm addicted to them. There's no way that I'm going to lose that. If I had to stop having sex with the animals forever, I could deal with that. If I had to live the rest of my life never knowing the feeling of a horse's hide under my hands, or the smell of its breath in my nostrils, or the look of my face reflected in its eyes, I would rather die."

— "... It's possible we can change. But I'll always have dogs in my life. Many times I've asked myself the question, 'Would I do anything differently?' And I look and I say, 'You know, if I had to have these impulses, then maybe I wouldn't have experienced confusion and the amount of loneliness I did... self hatred for a while. But also I look at how I am now, and the journey may have been rough, but I personally like who I am now...'"

— "In my own case... I've gone out with and been involved with a number of very great women, and I've yet to find anyone who showed any indication of tolerance for bestiality, and I'm not going to stay involved with somebody who's not going to be accepting..."

— "How do you bring it to your date? You know, honey, by the way, you kept asking why I was out at the barn late all the time..."

— "I've told my last two boyfriends that they can not be everything. That my interests are too great. They don't have hooves, a mane, tail, they can't have paws..."

— "One thing is, I believe, common to all zoos is that they won't even consider a long-term relationship with a human being unless that human being is fully prepared to accept the zoophilia."

— "That's not true for me. I don't buy that."

— "It is for me. The people here know that there are people who can't accept them... I married my wife because I thought it was the best acceptable thing."

— "... I can remember when I was 14 years old and I'm having these desires to be with the goats and the dogs and the horses... And at the same time thinking, 'How am I ever going to hide from my wife that I'm out, you know, having sex with the horses?'"

— "... I was at my grandparents' house and they're like, 'When are you gonna bring your girlfriend over?' so I said, 'I'll bring my dog next time' (laughter). And then next time I brought my dog, and they're like, 'You actually brought your dog?' And I'm like, 'Well, he keeps me warm at night... (laughter) and if he starts snoring, I put him in his house outside.' That killed the conversation for pretty much the whole day" (laughter).

— “My wife said she hoped I got doggie AIDS and died (laughter)... What she specifically told me was I was not to bring any of my weird Internet friends home, because they will get AIDS on her furniture” (laughter).

— “... there’s only one thing about zoophilia that I’d like to change, and that’s the fact that I can outlive everybody who I fall in love with. I’m on my fifth regular canine lover because the previous ones, by one means or another, have passed on. And that’s one of the hardest things about being a zoo. It’s the only thing I don’t like.”

— “... When I was with my first love (a dog)...I was to the point that I really couldn’t concentrate on my schoolwork at college, or even, I was at the National Guard, you know, just eight hours, lonely, having anxiety attacks to be back with her. And that kind of gives you an idea of what I went through when I lost her... I was depressed for two, three years, so deeply that I just, I couldn’t even concentrate. I stopped reading because I couldn’t even stay focused on more than a paragraph. I failed the first school that I went to in the Army, and ended up in training with drill sergeants for eight months... I spent my entire income just to be able to barely afford a house to live in, to support that lifestyle... My entire adult life I spent pursuing to be able to live that lifestyle... I just couldn’t be without a dog.”

— “I have known what I was when I was about 11 years old. My first love was on my paper route. She was an older female German Shepherd ... but I never had a chance to touch her because I was so horrified of getting caught. But when she finally died of cancer, I actually was like crying for a week because of that... And when I was 18, I had my first love. My parents let me buy a dog, and it was the happiest year of my life. And really... problems about, they gave her away and (crying)... You don’t want me to get into my story... (still crying and a few of the guys sitting next to him started hugging him). I went into a pure depression because of that, and almost committed suicide...”

— “... The problem with losing all the lovers all the time is that every time it takes a little piece of you, and you lose a little bit of confidence in yourself that you’ll ever be able to fall in love again... And the thing is, that I realize that after losing (my horse) and after losing all the other horses, and after losing the dog, after losing all of them, I was still able to feel the connection, to feel the bond that you feel love for another animal.”

“Why do you have sexual relations with animals?”

— “... It’s different for every person... For me, it becomes the why not question. Because I know what it’s like to wake up and be licked by a raspy tongue in the morning after having wonderful love with my dog the previous evening. And to deny myself that, and to deny my lover the pleasure that I know I can give him... why? What good reason is there not to experience some of the highest highs and to share those with somebody who you know loves you and who can express that love to you so well... There have been a couple people who I have fallen in love with, who haven’t, have said that they loved me but did not return that. I’ve never fallen in love with an animal that never returned that love. That doesn’t mean that I hold that against people. Some people just aren’t perfect. That’s fine. They’re not the right person for me.”

— “...dogs seem to be very compatible with people. Look at all the interactions we have with dogs. We groom them, we hug them and kiss them like we do with people we care about. Often, we’re actually more tactile with our dogs than we are with people. We feel protective of them, and very often dogs feel protective of us... It’s very fun to play (with) dogs. You understand them. So, if we’re interacting on all these different social levels, and it’s a question of the dog being a social unit, they why is it, you know, sex is of course the next step... So you can have even more interaction... And you don’t always know if it’s love or not. Love is a human concept. You can equate an animal actions into what love is for us, but then humans can’t even agree on what love is...”

— “I think the ‘why’ question’s pretty easy. It’s because we like it and it feels good. Another question is ‘how?’ or, ‘How did you get this way?’ I’m guessing that 99 percent of the people here grew up as labeled ‘odd’ by everyone around them... Quite a few people grew up being, you know, not very popular...”

— “The environment pushes you. The environment that we were raised in pushed us towards animals. It didn’t make us zoo, but not having as much interaction with human beings that I did, I was able to look elsewhere for companionship occasionally. Not all the time. I still had human friends, but I was a heck of a lot closer to my dogs than I was to any of the other kids that I hung around with at the time. It may not be the same for everyone, but I’m guessing that a lot of us were just kind of nudged in that general direction, you know, by our environment. It wasn’t the whole reason, but it was part of the reason.”

— “On the other side, that’s not the only reason. Because I was part of, I competed in a lot of athletic events in school, I was part of a very popular culture within my school. I had sex with young ladies about the same time that I, my earliest sexual experience was also with goats and with women. So I had both opportunities, but I have slowly selected, almost exclusive at this point, I’ve turned 40, and still single, it’s almost exclusively animals at this point...”

— “Yeah. See, I was married for five years... I’m out of that marriage, I’m divorced now, but out of that marriage I did have a child. But although she never did it (sex with animals), my ex, she and I had sex that was different sex than my canine sex. That is real sex, real love.”

— “(Why?) Because (laughter). I really can’t explain why. I was 11 years old when I had my first fantasies, so I don’t know why, or where I even got them from, you know... I don’t have a clue...”

— “... I started having sex with animals when I was eight, and at the time I didn’t really have any sense of right or wrong as to what I was doing. I knew that if I got caught by my mother I’d be in trouble, but I didn’t really know why I would be in trouble. I knew that it felt really good and I really liked doing it...”

— “... I don’t know about hereditary, but I feel like I was born this way. I’ve always been close to nature and animals and everything else like that and I just guess I never felt like it was really wrong. I couldn’t see that if I loved an animal this much, why not take it an extra step? I just feel like I was born this way. There wasn’t anything that happened in my childhood to turn me off from women, or anything like that. I wasn’t an anti-social kid. My parents even told me that I was a normal kid” (laughter).

— “...I was always emotionally attached to animals... But I was also physically attracted to animals on the street, you know. It was just like, I guess heteros see a hot woman and they’re like, ‘(look at) that woman.’ And I see an attractive animal, and I’m like, ‘Whoa, that’s a really attractive animal.’ And it’s always been that way, and I think it’s hereditary...”

— “I don’t feel like I really had a choice, I guess. That it’s just the way I am, and there’s no way that I could say that I’m not a zoo. It’s not like I decided to have sex with animals, or I decided to have this attachment or love for animals. It’s like, I can’t ignore it. It’s part of me, and I can’t, I couldn’t possibly have a normal relationship without that... This is just the way I am, and if I’m going to be true to myself, then this is the way I’m going to have to live — it’s not an option...”

— “Another aspect perhaps of ‘why’ is I’ve always had problems dealing with and interaction with people, and it created a lot of tension when I had to do that in school and work and all. And the time I spent with my companions (animals) was relaxing, and helped me deal, and unwind, and deal with tension...”

I asked about the need for intellectual stimulation for those who prefer animals as sex partners.

— “I have a social group, social peers I hang out with, that satisfies my desire for deep meaningful conversation if I choose to engage in it.”

— “...I don’t think any of us here are total recluses to the point where we only interact with the animals and don’t really have any interest in other humans.”

— “...I’m sure there are plenty of people who are married to paraplegics, or people with various motor nervous disorders that can’t speak, can’t talk back to them... I’m saying that there are people who are married to companions, or have companions that, they are not capable of having high-level, intellectual conversations.”

— “I know humans who you can’t have high-level conversations with” (laughter).

— “And animals can be intellectually as challenging on their own...”

— “It’s intellectually challenging to take care of a horse, you know, to understand it and understand its needs.”

— “... We all have to interact with society, and we have our jobs, or school, or your family life...”

— “...it’s a separate thing. You go one place for one thing and you go to the other place for the other thing, and it becomes a natural part of your life where you don’t even think about it anymore...”

— “... I think that there’s something definitely missing in a zoo relationship... Everything about my dog is, I think is fabulous. But I can’t get the kind of, you know, private communication, and the kind of, you know, like spiritual type communication that you can get from another person... It’s a completely different style of, it’s completely different. I mean, I can’t even describe it. It’s like comparing apples to oranges. The two aren’t the same... I think to be, or at least for me, to be complete, I need both of those...”

CHAPTER 7

THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The Questionnaire

I came back from the weekend gathering with lots of ideas for questions. I also took some ideas from *The Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality's Standard Sex Profile* (1984), *The Kinsey Data* (Gebhard & Johnson, 1979), and *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey* (Michael, Gagnon, Laumann & Kolata, 1994). The final version of the questionnaire consisted of 350 items over 23 pages.

Since I was already biased about zoos being intelligent, interesting, friendly, and happy about being zoos, as the ones I met in the gathering and those who opened up to me through the telephone seemed to be, I tried very hard to remain objective in my questions. I therefore, asked questions that would reveal those zoos who may be different than the rest. I wanted to know whether there were zoos out there who did not want to be zoos, who were unhappy, who had sex with animals because they had no other choice, and who were not as smart or friendly.

The questionnaire consisted of both open-ended questions and questions that required completion or checking off the best answer. This was done for the purpose of obtaining quantitative as well as qualitative information. Some questions involved various items that were measured on a Likert-type scale. The Likert scale was somewhat different for every question to eliminate response-set. There was also repetition of some questions with different wording to ensure reliability.

The questionnaire included three sections: Section A consisted of questions 1 through 77, and covered general information and demographics. Most of the questions in that section comprised the control variables. Section B consisted of questions 78 through 207, which covered the participant's psycho-sexual general development, and Section C included questions 208 through 349, and covered information about sexual relations with animals. Question 350 simply asked "Is there anything else you would like to share?"

The dependent variable was the practice of sexual relations with animals. I wanted to include only subjects who have experienced sex with animals. The questions that specifically asked about this were questions 198, 212-216, and 301-314. The three independent variables for the main research question — is there a sexual orientation toward non-human animals? — and their related questions included:

- (1) The existence of affectional orientation toward animals (Questions 218, 287, 308, 315-316, and 337-338),
- (2) The existence of sexual fantasy about having sex with animals (Questions 180-182, 220, and 293), and
- (3) The existence of erotic orientation toward animals (Questions 217, 219-220, 261-269, 289, 310, 337-338, 340, and 343-344).

Before the questionnaires were distributed to the participants, they were completed by some of my colleagues and friends, and by two of the subjects, who were then excluded from the study's sample list. Their comments and feedback were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire. Appendix II includes a copy of the questionnaire.

Methods

As mentioned before, I decided I only wanted to study people who had had actual experiences of sexual relations with animals (many people who only fantasized about this behavior had to be eliminated from

the study). Every participant was required to make telephone or personal contact with me, to allow us to chat. This was important since I needed the opportunity to screen the participant for authenticity, and to obtain the individual's address. I wanted to know if I was talking to a woman, a man, or a child, and I had better chances knowing this by talking to them on the telephone rather than through the Internet. On the Internet anyone can be anyone. Individuals under the age of consent were eliminated from the study.

I wanted the participants' postal address, not an e-mail address because I wanted some control over who gets the questionnaire and who returns it. On the Internet people could have forwarded the questionnaire to others who never contacted me, and I tried to eliminate this possibility. Every questionnaire had my original signature on it. If it were to come back xeroxed, the questionnaire would have been eliminated from the study.

Every participant received a packet consisting of a questionnaire, a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and a letter of explanation which was also the consent form (see Appendix II). The letter/consent form followed the relevant guidelines set forth by the 1995's revised edition of the *Code Of Federal Regulations (21 CFR 50.20 & 50.25)*, which explains the requirements for informed consent of human subjects. The letter, therefore, explained the purpose of the study, described the possible discomforts that the participant might experience as a result of filling out the questionnaire, discussed confidentiality and anonymity, pointed out whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions, and stressed that participation in the study is voluntary. The participants were requested to sign the bottom of the letter with their initials or any name they might choose, and to send it back together with the completed questionnaire. Questionnaires that were returned without a signature, were eliminated from the study.

The research was conducted as a double-blind study. I was the only person who had access to the subjects' addresses, which were destroyed after the questionnaires were sent out. The completed questionnaires were sent back to me, without a return address (for the most part), so that I had no way of knowing who were the respondents.

On September 25, 1996, twenty-five questionnaires were sent out to 25 participants who were randomly chosen from the sample. By January 17, 1997, fifteen completed questionnaires came back. These completed questionnaires comprised a Pilot Study, which was conducted for the purpose of assessing the face and content validity of the questionnaire. This was the idea of my Dissertation Committee (Dr. Judy Seifer, Dr. Jerry Zientara, and Dr. Robert Phillips), and I was not happy about it because it meant more work. But, it turned out to be a good idea, since I realized I needed to change my coding system and modify some of the wording, to make my questions more coherent. The data from the Pilot Study were incorporated within the final results of the study.

During the month of March 1997, a hundred and twenty five questionnaires were sent out to all the participants who were not included in the Pilot study. Together with the 25 questionnaires which were sent out at the time of the Pilot study, the total number of questionnaires which was sent out was 150. Of those 150, four envelopes were "returned to sender," two participants did not sign the consent form and thus were eliminated from the sample, and one questionnaire was returned blank. Several potential participants have called me in the months that followed, complaining that they have not received their questionnaire, which was probably lost in the mail.

CHAPTER 8

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PARTICIPANTS

Of the total 150 questionnaires that were sent out, 93 (62%) participants sent their completed questionnaires back to me, which comprised this study. Out of 132 men, 82 (62%), sent back their questionnaires, and out of 18 women, 11 (61%) sent back theirs. The study is made of these 82 men and 11 women.

How did the Participants Find Out About the Study? (Question 1)

The majority of men (59=72%) and women (9=82%) heard about the study through the Internet, either by seeing a posting or through an Internet friend. More specifically, the subjects heard about the study from the following sources:

- Posting on the Internet (42 participants = 45%),
- A friend through the Internet (26 participants = 28%),
- An ad in *The Wild Animal Revue* magazine (9 participants = 10%),
- Me (8 participants = 9%),
- A friend outside of the Internet (5 participants = 5%),
- An article in the *Baltimore City Paper* (2 participants = 2%), and
- An ad in the SSSS' newsletter (1 participant = 1%).

Age (Question 2)

The participants in the study were older than the stereotypical farm adolescent boy of the Kinsey study. The average age of the men was 38, ranging from 19 to 78 (with a standard deviation of 13.65, a median of 37, and a mode of 21), and the average age of the women was 36, ranging from 21 to 48 (with a standard deviation of 9.17, a median of 35 and a mode of 47). Five men were 21, one man was 70 and another was 78 years old. The following table represents the participants' ages:

<u>Age Range</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
19 to 29 years of age	26 = 32%	4 = 36%
30 to 39 years of age	22 = 27%	3 = 27%
40 to 49 years of age	21 = 26%	4 = 36%
50 to 59 years of age	5 = 5%	0
60 to 69 years of age	6 = 6%	0
70 to 78 years of age	2 = 2%	0

Racial Background (Question 4)

The majority of men (77=94%) and women (10=91%) in this study were Caucasian. The following table depicts the participants' racial backgrounds:

	<u>Caucasian</u>	<u>African-American</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Multiracial</u>	<u>Other</u>
Men (82)	77=94%	2=2%	0	1=1%	2=2%	0
Women (11)	10=91%	0	0	1=9%	0	0

(Of the two multiracial men, one was Caucasian/Hispanic, and the other did not specify his racial background).

Religious Background (Questions 30-31)

Fifty-three men (65%) reported they were raised Christian; of whom 13 (25%) were raised Catholic and 40 (75%) were raised within a variety of Protestant denominations. Nine women (82%) were raised Christian; of whom four (44%) were raised Catholic, and five (56%) were raised within a variety of Protestant denominations. The following table depicts the participants' religious backgrounds:

<u>Religious Background</u>	<u>Men (81)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Protestant	40 = 49%	5 = 45%
Catholic	13 = 16%	4 = 36%
None	20 = 25%	2 = 18%
Jehovah's Witness	2 = 2%	
Jewish	2 = 2%	
Wicca/Shamanism	2 = 2%	
Dragon Beliefs & Buddhism	1 = 1%	
Native American Spiritualism	1 = 1%	

Three men pointed out that at this point in their lives they had no religious association, and another two volunteered the information that they were currently practicing Shamanism/Wicca. One of the women who was raised Protestant reported she has converted to Catholicism, and was now affiliated with the Catholic Church.

More than half the men (48=59%) and women (6=55%) reported they never attend religious services. Yet, seven men (9%) and one woman reported they attend religious services approximately once a month, and another six men (7%) and one woman attended religious services at least once a week. These data seem surprising since no current religion condones human-animal sexual contact; in fact, most religions condemn such behaviors. Among the men and women who seem to have close connections to religion, only two men and one woman reported they did not engage in bestiality anymore.

The following table reflects the participants' answers to question 31 which asked about the frequency of attending religious services:

<u>Frequency of attendance</u>	<u>Men (81)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Never	48 = 59%	6 = 55%
Sometimes	12 = 15%	3 = 27%
During Religious Holidays	8 = 10%	0
Approximately Once a Month	7 = 9%	1 = 9%
At Least Once a Week	6 = 7%	1 = 9%

The 82nd man, who is not included in the above table, reported that watching Billy Graham crusades and others on TV are like religious services for him. He did not specify, however, how often he watches these programs on TV.

Education (Question 27)

Kinsey *et al.* (1948 & 1953) concluded that people who have sex with animals are often more educated than the general population. In the current study, almost half the men (39=48%) and women (5=45%) were college graduates or above. The following table depicts the participants' level of education:

Level of Education	Men (82)	Women (11)
Some Highschool	3 = 4%	0
Highschool Graduate	9 = 11%	1 = 9%
Some College	31 = 38%	5 = 45%
College Graduate	30 = 37%	4 = 36%
Master's Degree	6 = 7%	1 = 9%
Ph.D. or M.D.	3 = 4%	0

(One man in the College Graduate category was a graduate of a Seminary. This man was the late Mark Matthews, author of *The Horseman*).

Occupations (Question 28)

I found it interesting that only six men (7%) and one woman reported they work in animal-related fields, such as a dog trainer and kennel operator, a veterinary technician, and a wildlife biologist/zoologist/scientist. From my conversations with zoos, it seemed to me that many zoos look for jobs that will allow them to be in the proximity of animals. I therefore expected to have more participants who worked with animals. Obviously, their reports about their vocations may exclude other involvements the participants may have had with animals.

Overall, the participants' occupations varied greatly. The following depicts their different vocations:

Occupations	Men (81)	Women (11)
Computer-related fields	13 = 16%	
Artists (including photographers)	9 = 11%	
Students	7 = 9%	3 = 27%
Technicians or Mechanics	7	
Animal-related fields	6 = 7%	1 = 9%
Engineers	6	
Medical Field	3 = 4%	2 = 18%
Delivery	4 = 5%	
Manual Labor	4	
Sales	3 = 4%	
Secretarial Work	2 = 2%	1 = 9%
Accountants	1 = 1%	1
College Professors	2 = 2%	
Counselors	2	
(Disabled)	2	
Librarians	2	
(Unemployed)	2	
A "BagBoy/stoker"	1 = 1%	
A "full-time mother"		1
A Physicist	1	
(A Retired "cycling coach")		1
(A Retired Minister)	1	
(Retired — no specification)	1	
A Security Officer	1	
A Truck Driver	1	
A Writer		1

Annual Income (Question 29)

The majority of the men (47=59%) and women (7=64%) in this study earned less than \$30,000 per year. The following table represents the participants' annual income level:

<u>Annual Income</u>	<u>Men (80)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Below \$20,000	28 = 35%	4 = 36%
Between \$20,000 and \$30,000	19 = 24%	3 = 27%
Between \$30,001 and \$40,000	12 = 15%	2 = 18%
Between \$40,001 and \$50,000	9 = 11%	
Between \$50,001 and \$100,000	11 = 14%	2 = 18%
Above \$100,001	1 = 1%	

Place of Residence (Questions 25 and 71)

Originally, 150 potential volunteers responded to participate in the study. Of them, 128 reported living in the United States, 11 were from Canada, four from Germany, three from the United Kingdom, two from Australia, one from Taiwan, and another volunteer for the study was from Israel.

Out of the final 93 participants who participated in the study, 71 men (87%) and all the women were from the United States. The following table represents the participants' place of residence, excluding one man and one woman, who live in the United States but did not specify in what state they reside:

<u>State/Country</u>	<u>Men (81)</u>	<u>Women (10)</u>
California	8 = 10%	3 = 30%
Washington	6 = 7%	
Ohio	5 = 6%	
Oklahoma	5	
Virginia	4 = 5%	1 = 10%
Germany	4	
Iowa	4	
Texas	4	
Canada	3 = 4%	
Florida	2 = 3%	1
Georgia	2	1
Maryland	3 = 4%	
North Carolina	3	
Pennsylvania	2 = 2%	1
United Kingdom	3 = 4%	
Louisiana	2 = 2%	
Maine	1 = 1%	1
Minnesota	2	
New Mexico	2	
New York	1 = 1%	1
Oregon	2	
Alabama	1 = 1%	
Alaska	1	
Arizona	1	
Arkansas	1	
Australia	1	
Colorado	1	
Massachusetts	1	
Michigan	1	
Missouri	1	

Continued

<u>State/Country</u>	<u>Men (81)</u>	<u>Women (10)</u>
Mississippi		1
New Hampshire	1	
South Carolina	1	
South Dakota	1	
Wisconsin	1	

Only 16 men (20%) and one woman reported they were living on a farm at the time of the study. This seemed very surprising since according to Kinsey *et al.* (1948), Gebhard *et al.* (1965), and Hunt (1974), bestiality is largely confined to people who live on farms. My question, however, was worded in such a way: “Do you currently live on a farm? Yes, No,” that it did not provide for any information about the number of participants who lived in rural areas which are not considered farms.

Marital/Relationship Status (Questions 5-16)

Eighty one men responded to question 5 which asked “How many different people have you been married to or lived in a sexual relationship with for a month or more?” Twenty-one men (26%) reported they were never married or lived in a sexual relationship with another person for a month or more. The average number of different people the men were married to or cohabitated with is 1.94, with a standard deviation of 3. The minimum number is obviously zero, and the maximum number reported is 20 different partners. The median and mode are 1. Thirty men (37%) have had one such relationship.

Three women (27%) reported they were never married or lived in a sexual relationship with another person for a month or more. The average number of different people the women participants were married to or cohabitated with is 1.82, with a standard deviation of 1.47. The maximum reported number of different partners is four, as reported by two women, and the median and mode are 2.

Data from questions 6-15 (“What is your current marital/relationship status?”) are not mutually exclusive. Almost half the men (37=45%) and the majority of women (7=64%) were single at the time of the study. Twenty-six men (32%) and one woman (9%) were married, and 10 men (12%) and two women (18%) were divorced. The following table depicts the participants’ marital/relationship status at the time of the study:

<u>Marital/Relationship Status</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Single	37=45%	7=64%
Married	26=32%	1= 9%
Divorced	10=12%	2=18%
Intimate relationship with a human male lover	6= 7%	0
Intimate relationship with a human female lover	6= 7%	0
Other	5= 6%	0
Living with a human female lover	3= 4%	0
Living with a human male lover	2= 2%	1= 9%
Separated	0	2=18%
Widowed	1= 1%	0

Under the category “Other,” four men chose to describe their marital/relationship status as it applies to their relationship with their animal lover. One man wrote: “(I am) married to my female horse,” and another wrote: “(I am) in an intimate relationship with my animal lover.” Another man reported he is in “an intimate relationship with a human male zoo companion” which apparently does not include sexual relations between the two men.

Eighty-one men reported having an average number 0.74 children, with a standard deviation of 1.22, and a maximum number of four. The 10 women who responded to this question reported an average of 0.5 children, with a standard deviation of 1.08, and a maximum number of three children. The majority of men

(56=69%) and women (8=80%) had no children; only 25 men and two women reported having children. The following table depicts the number of children the participants' have:

	<u>0 Children</u>	<u>1 Child</u>	<u>2 Children</u>	<u>3 Children</u>	<u>4 Children</u>
Men (81)	56=69%	4=5%	10=12%	8=10%	3=4%
Women (10)	8=80%	0	1=10%	1=10%	0

Living Situation (Questions 17-24)

One woman and 23 men (28%) lived with their spouse at the time of the study (although previously 26 men reported they were married). Twenty men (24%) and four women (36%) lived by themselves, and the majority of men (55=67%) and women (8=73%) lived with pets. (It is important to note that the reported living situations are not mutually exclusive. Male participant R=18, for example, lived with his spouse, as well as with a human male lover and a pet. Others reported living combinations such as living with a spouse, children, and pets). The following table depicts the participants' living situation:

<u>Living Situation</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Living with pets	55=67%	8=73%
Living with a spouse	23=28%	1= 9%
Living by yourself	20=24%	4=36%
Living with a roommate	17=21%	3=27%
Living with parents	12=14%	1
Living with children	8=10%	2=18%
Living with a human male lover	3= 4%	1
Living with a human female lover	4= 5%	0

It is interesting to note that 26 men (32%) and one woman (9%) reported they were married at the time of the study. Twenty-three men and one woman reported they lived with their spouse. Yet, only four of the married men no longer engage in bestiality (one of them did not live with his spouse). This means that at the time of the study, 21 men and one woman were married, lived with their spouse, and had sex with animals at the same time.

Owning Pets and Other Animals (Questions 24, 71, and 74-75)

Although only one woman (9%) and 16 men (20%) lived on a farm at the time of the study (question 71), the majority of participants reported they own pets and/or other animals. In question 24, fifty-five men (67%) and eight women (73%) reported they lived with pets at the time of the study. In question 74, which asked if the participants currently own any pets/animals, the number for the women remained consistent, but more men (59=72%) reported owning pets. Overall, about 70 percent of men and women reported having pets/animals at the time of the study.

Many participants reported having more than one pet/animal. The following represents the 59 men and eight women's reports about the types of animals they owned at the time of the study (One man pointed out that he has livestock, but did not specify which animals are on his farm):

<u>Type of Animal</u>	<u>Men (59)</u>	<u>Women (8)</u>
Canines	43=73%	7=88%
Felines	20=34%	2=25%
Equines (ponies, mares, donkeys, llamas...)	15=25%	1=13%
Goats	4= 7%	
Bovines	3= 5%	
Fowls (chickens and birds)	2= 3%	2=25%

Continued

<u>Type of Animal</u>	<u>Men (59)</u>	<u>Women (8)</u>
Sheep	2	
Snakes	2	
Fish	1= 2%	

Some of the participants who did not have pets at the time of the study provided explanations. For example:

“I currently have no animals, but that is more due to circumstance than desires. I have owned animals since I was six, and plan to have them again within 6 months. ...I had to put down my best friend and greatest companion 3 years ago. That was definitely the worst day of my life. It overshadows my mother’s death (I loved her dearly) by a hundred fold.”

In other words, 27 (in question 24) or 23 men (in question 74) and three women did not have pets at the time of the study. Six of these men and one of the women in this category reported they no longer have sex with animals. Another three men reported they were not having sex with animals at the time of the study since they did not have access to them. It is further possible, that the others lived with farm animals which they did not consider pets.

On Being Vegetarian (Questions 68-69)

From my conversations with zoos, I expected many zoos to practice vegetarianism. However, only nine men (11%) and none of the women reported they were vegetarian. One woman commented that she tries to avoid eating meat, and two men added that although they are not vegetarian, they will not “eat the flesh of animals of species members of which are my lovers.” Three (33%) out of the nine vegetarian men did not eat meat due to health reasons. The other six men were vegetarian “out of respect for the animal,” and “love of animal.” One man commented: “I identify strongly with horses, and horses do not eat meat.”

Social Life (Questions 21, 42, 49-54, 56, 58, 220, 280-282, 290, 302-303, and 311)

One of the most asked questions is are people who have sexual relations with animals lonely? That is, have they no friends, are they loners, shy, and social introverts? As mentioned before, some authors believe that for a lonely person, bestiality substitutes for the missing or otherwise unavailable human companion or sexual partner (Hirschfeld in Niemoeller, 1946b; Hunt, 1974; Masters, 1962; Rappaport, 1968). Isolation (Blake, 1971; Cerrone, 1991; Christy, 1967; Ratliff, 1976), loneliness, and a need for companionship (Blake, 1971; Christy, 1967) are often countered through sexual contact with animals and pets. Stekel (1952) adds that friendless people are inclined to seek the companionship of pets. Thus, he says, it is no wonder that among people who have engaged in sexual contact with animals, we find many lonely, unmarried people.

The participants were asked how many close human friends they had at the time of the study. Although at that time 20 men (24%) and four women (36%) reported living by themselves, the men related having an average of 7.2 close friends and the women 4.18. Only three men (4%) reported they had no human friends at the time of the study. The following table depicts the participants’ responses (The 82nd man participant responded to this question with the word “many” (friends)).

	<u>Average No</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Minimum No</u>	<u>Maximum No</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Men (81)	7.2	7.01	0 (3 men)	50	4 (11 men)
Women (11)	4.18	1.99	1	9	4 (6 women)

They were then asked to specify how often they meet or talk with their close human friends. Overall, the majority of both men (54=68%) and women (8=73%) in this study reported having either daily or weekly contact with their close human friends. The following depicts their responses:

Frequency	Men (79)	Women (11)
Daily	18=23%	4=36%
Weekly	36=45%	4=36%
Monthly	9=11%	3=27%
Less than once a month	9=11%	
Other	7= 9%	

The “Other” category was created for those unable to choose the appropriate category of contact frequency, since these participants reported having several friends whom they saw at various frequencies. One woman commented, that contact “depends — daily in some cases, weekly in others — depends on what is occurring in both sets of lives.” One man described his social contacts as “weekly phone calls to one or another, weekly get together for cards, social interaction or movies. Gathering reunions twice or three times annually.” Another man commented: “I try to keep in touch with all my friends on a regular basis although they are spread all over the country. I travel a lot and use both the Net and phone to communicate with them.”

It is important to note, that although the majority of participants reported they have close friends, and they reported having either daily or weekly contact with their close human friends, these data do not tell us much about the quality, the level of closeness, and intimacy (not sexual) the participants share with their friends. But on the surface, the participants in the current study seem to be capable of having close human relationships.

Participants were further asked to rate themselves on an introvert/extrovert sociability scale. The following represents their responses:

Level of Sociability	Men (82)	Women (11)
1=Very out-going, loves to be around people, has many friends	6 = 7%	3=27%
2=	9 =11%	1= 9%
3=Sometimes likes to be with people, has several friends	38 =46%	3=27%
4=	24 =29%	4=36%
5=Very shy, likes to be alone, does not have any friends	5 = 6%	0

As it appears, the majority of the men (62=76%) and women (7=64%) rated themselves as “3” and “4,” which means that they perceive themselves as average social beings, with a slight inclination toward being social introverts. These are the participants’ subjective perceptions about themselves (it is interesting to note that one of the men who rated himself as a “5” reported in previous questions that he lives with two close friends, and that he has three other close friends with whom he has contact “whenever possible”). Fifteen men (18%) and four women (36%) rated themselves as “1” and “2,” which means that they perceive themselves as very out-going individuals who like to be around people. And 38 men (46%) and three women (3=27%) rated themselves as “3” (sometimes likes to be with people, has several friends). It appears that the majority of participants perceived themselves as friendly, out-going individuals. Indeed, throughout the questionnaire, the majority of participants reported being involved in various relationships with other human beings, although, as mentioned before, the quality of these relationships is unknown.

The majority of the men (65=79%) and all but one woman (91%) reported they were connected to the Internet. The following table depicts their responses to the question: “How many hours per week do you normally spend ‘visiting’ your friends on the Internet?”:

	Average No	SD	Minimum No	Maximum No	Median	Mode
Men (65)	13.13	15.84	0 (6 men)	100	10	2 (8 men)
Women (10)	14.35	15.70	0	50	10	

One man commented that he has no friends on the Internet, yet he surfs the net 14 hours a week.

In addition, the majority of men (57=70%) and women (7=64%) reported they spent time “somewhat” or “primarily” with friends while growing up. Friends were the second most popular party, after animals, with whom the men spent time, and the fourth most popular party for the women, after both parents, animals, and their mothers (see **With Whom did the Participants Spend Time?** in Chapter 9).

Jumping a head a bit, I asked the participants specifically if having no human partners available, being lonely, being too shy to have sex with humans, or not being allowed to associate with boys and girls were the reasons they began having sex with animals. The following table depicts the men’s responses to these four questions:

	Number Of Men Responding	Completely and/or Mostly True	Somewhat True	Not True
I had no human partners available	79	24=30%	26	29=37%
I was lonely	81	22=27%	26	33=41%
I was too shy to have sex with humans	80	17=21%	26	37=46%
I was not allowed to associate with boys/girls	80	1= 1%	13	66=83%

The following table depicts the women’s responses to these four questions:

	Number Of Women Responding	Completely and/or Mostly True	Somewhat True	Not True
I was lonely	10	1=10%	3	6= 60%
I had no human partners available	10	0	3	7= 70%
I was too shy to have sex with humans	10	0	3	7= 70%
I was not allowed to associate with boys/girls	10	0	0	10=100%

As can be seen from the two tables, 24 men (30%) and none of the women reported it was “completely true” or “mostly true” that they began having sex with animals because they “had no human partners available,” while 29 men (37%) and seven women (70%) reported it was “not true” for them. Twenty two men (27%) and one woman reported it was “completely true” or “mostly true” that they began having sex with animals because they were “lonely,” while 33 men (41%) and six women (60%) reported it was “not true” for them. Seventeen men (21%) and none of the women reported it was “completely true” or “mostly true” that they started having sex with animals because they were “too shy to have sex with humans,” while 37 men (46%) and seven women (70%) reported it was “not true” for them. And one man and none of the women reported it was “completely true” for him that he began having sex with animals because he was not allowed to associate with boys and girls, while 66 men (83%) and all 10 women who responded to this question reported it was “not true” for them.

Among the open-ended answers to the question “What made you get into sex with animals?,” 11 men (14%) and one woman related that “lack of social interaction” led them to have sex with animals. The following are examples of what two men in this category described

— “I did not have the self-confidence necessary to pursue human females nor the social skills to recognize when they were attracted to me.” And,

— “I only had a dog for a friend. I wanted to please him so I gave him a blow-job.”

I then asked the participants specifically if having no human partners available, being lonely, or being too shy to have sex with humans were the reasons they were currently having sex with animals. Sixty-seven men responded to these three questions. The following table depicts the men’s responses:

	Completely and/ or Mostly True	Sometimes True	Not True
I am lonely	10=15%	19	38=57%
I have no human partners available	8=12%	13	46=69%
I am too shy to have sex with humans	5= 7%	11	51=76%

Nine women responded to these three questions. The following table depicts their responses:

	Completely and/ or Mostly True	Sometimes True	Not True
I am lonely	0	4	5=56%
I have no human partners available	0	1	8=89%
I am too shy to have sex with humans	0	1	8=89%

As can be seen from these two tables, 10 men (15%) and none of the women reported it was “completely true” or “mostly true” that they were now having sex with animals because they were “lonely,” while 38 men (57%) and five women (56%) reported it was “not true” for them. Eight men (12%) and none of the women reported it was “completely true” or “mostly true” that they were having sex with animals because they “have no human partners available,” while 46 men (69%) and eight women (89%) reported it was “not true” for them. And five men (7%) and none of the women reported it was “completely true” or “mostly true” that they were having sex with animals because they were “too shy to have sex with humans,” while 51 men (76%) and eight women reported it was “not true” for them.

These statistics show that some of the participants started and/or were having sex with animals at the time of the study partially because they had no other available sex partners, they were too shy to have sex with humans, they were lonely, and/or they suffered from lack of social interaction. The majority of participants, however, reported this was not the case for them.

Physical Health (Question 76)

The majority of participants reported they were healthy. The following table depicts their answers to the question “In general, would you say your health is:”

Level of Health	Men (82)	Women (11)
Excellent	36=44%	5=45%
Good	37=45%	4=36%
Fair	7= 9%	2=18%
Poor	2= 2%	0

Mental Health (Questions 59-67, 77 and 343-344)

As mentioned before, Menninger (1951) proposes that sexual relations with animals that persists in adult life, suggests an “inconclusiveness or unsatisfactoriness in reality,” thus the need of a deviant love object. Ramsis (1969) proposes that most people who engage in bestiality share a common theme of sexual unhappiness.

In the current study, half of the men (41=50%) have been in psychotherapy, with an average of 2.13 psychotherapists and a standard deviation of 1.22. The maximum number of psychotherapists whom one participant (actually three different participants) went to see was five, the median was two, and the mode was one. More than half of the women (6=55%) have been in psychotherapy, with an average of 2.5 psychotherapists and a standard deviation of 1.05. The maximum number of psychotherapists whom one women participant went to see was four, the median was 2.5, and the mode was two. It should be noted, however, that this information, by itself, does not provide any data about the participants’ mental nor happiness status; many people, nowadays, go to therapy for a variety of reasons.

About half of the 41 men (21=51%) who have been in psychotherapy told their psychotherapists they have had sex with animals. Question 65 asked about the psychotherapists’ reactions upon finding out their clients/patients had sex with animals. Eleven of these 21 men (52%) reported they experienced negative reactions. Seven men (33%) experienced a neutral reaction, and five men (24%) reported they experienced positive reactions from their psychotherapists (the total is more than 100% since several men related different reactions from the different therapists they saw).

The following are examples of what the 11 men who experienced negative reactions from their psychotherapists related —

— “Sometimes I felt like a lab rat. (Had to) end my last therapy because my therapist tried to force me stopping. My experiences with ‘professional’ therapists were mostly negative, in fact so bad that my last one nearly drove me into suicide.”

— “He thought I was joking and laughed.” And —

— “I told the therapist that I was a zoophile. He didn’t know what a zoophile was. I left minutes later.”

The following are examples of what the seven men who reported they experienced a neutral reaction from their psychotherapists related —

— “He had no problem with it.” And —

— “One therapist called a lawyer to find out if she had to report my contact — lawyer said zoophilia victimless and reporting not necessary (in CA).”

The following is an example of what one of the five men who reported they experienced positive reactions from their psychotherapists related —

“He was very curious and understanding. Not once did he bring up the issue that I ‘had’ to change who I was. He said it was more important that I be happy with myself.” (This participant, however, reported he had a total of five psychotherapists).

Since most of the men went to more than one psychotherapist, the professionals’ reactions varied. For instant, participant A=1 related: “First one tried to ‘cure’ me. Others said it was no problem.” And participant G=7 reported his psychotherapists “didn’t know how to handle it in three out of four cases.”

Only two women (33%) out of the six who have been in psychotherapy told their psychotherapists they have had sex with animals. Neither had a negative experience. One woman related: “Two of them were neutral. Other two didn’t know.” The other woman related that her psychotherapist’s reaction was “Puzzlement since I was her first zoo, then acceptance.”

Surprisingly, only about half of the 41 men and only two women out of the six who had been in psychotherapy told their psychotherapists they have had sex with animals. Eleven of these 21 men reported they experienced negative reactions from their psychotherapists. Particularly noteworthy, some participants reported their therapists lacked knowledge of zoophilia, laughed upon hearing their client was having sex with animals, or tried to force their clients to stop having sex with animals.

Seventeen men (21%) reported they have been diagnosed with mental health problems (six of them had a dual diagnosis) —

— Seven of these men were diagnosed with Depression (including one with Dysthymia).

— Two men were diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder.

— Three men reported they had a nervous breakdown: one was hospitalized for three weeks, and then was in an outpatient clinic for six months. Another related that it was a job related stress reaction, and the third man explained that he had a nervous breakdown because of social problems at his job.

— One man was diagnosed with Anti-Social Personality Disorder.

— One man was diagnosed with Avoidant Personality Disorder.

— One man was “diagnosed” with “lack of ability to socialize.”

— Three men were diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder, and another man with suspected Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder.

— Two men were diagnosed with paraphilic disorders. One was diagnosed with Exhibitionism and Voyeurism, and the other reported he was diagnosed with having “sexual problems.”

Three women (27%) reported they have been diagnosed with mental health problems; all three have been diagnosed with Depression. One of the women related: “I was very depressed from about eight to 17 and I still fight with it sometimes.”

Eighteen men (22%) reported they tried to commit suicide. The average number of times these men tried to end their life was 2.35, with a standard deviation of 2.57. The median and mode were two. Eight men reported they tried to commit suicide twice. One man tried to end his life 12 times. The reasons he pointed out were “despair, feeling like a total waste, depression, some drugs, some arguments, you name it, it probably had some cause.” Six other men reported that although they have not tried to commit suicide, they have thought about it.

The men who tried to commit suicide and the men who only thought about it provided reasons for their thoughts and actions. Among the reasons mentioned were —

— Seven men: isolation, loneliness, depression, despair, rejection, feeling unloved, low self-esteem, anger, and stress.

— Three men: interpersonal problems with lovers/significant others.

— One man: hated himself for being attracted to other boys.

— One man: was troubled by his step-dad’s drinking.

— One man: experienced “mental depression due to estrogen therapy for male to female transsexual” (which means he must have been diagnosed with Gender Identity Disorder).

— Two men: being a zoo: “Figuring out that I am zoo, felt like a freak.” And “Feeling I was the only one in the world who felt like I do for animals.”

One man, who did not try to commit suicide, commented in question 58 that he has engaged in self abuse/mutilation: “I’ve occasionally intentionally cut and/or injured myself to feel pain and see my blood — mostly so I could pick the scabs.”

Only one woman reported she once tried to commit suicide. She said: “(I) was in (a) relationship of abuse and thought the only way I could get out of it was by dying.” Three other women reported they have thought about ending their lives. One woman explained: “I came very close a few times during my previous marriage while my ex abused me.” Another woman reported : “(I) thought about it some, but couldn’t bear leaving my animals behind.”

It is common knowledge that suicide rates are high among gays and lesbians. They tend to grow up feeling different, lonely, isolated, and unable to talk to others about their homosexual feelings. Since zoophiles have similar experiences, and if zoophilia/zoosexuality is a form of sexual orientation, it may not be surprising that 18 men (22%) and one woman (9%) reported they tried to commit suicide, and six other men and three other women reported they thought about it. Yet, only two men reported the reason for thinking about and/or trying to commit suicide was being a zoo. It is possible that the seven men who provided reasons such as isolation, loneliness, depression, despair, rejection, feeling unloved, low self-esteem, anger, and stress may have experienced these feelings because of being zoos.

During the 12 months prior to the study, however, the majority of men (57=69%) and women (9=82%) reported they were pretty happy with their personal life. The following table depicts their answers to this question:

<u>Level of Happiness</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Extremely happy	13=16%	1= 9%
Very happy most of the time	17=20%	5=45%
Generally satisfied, pleased	27=33%	3=27%
Sometimes fairly unhappy	20=24%	1
Unhappy most of the time	5= 6%	1

The participants' contentment with life was also evident in questions 343-344, where 70 men (85%) and eight women (73%) reported they do not want to stop having sex with animals. Through the participants' explanations, it appears that the number of participants who do not wish to stop having sex with animals is probably even higher than reported.

CHAPTER 9

THE PARTICIPANTS' CHILDHOOD HISTORY

Where Were the Participants Raised? (Questions 26 and 70)

Twenty-six men (33%) and six women (55%) reported they were raised in more than one state or country. One of the women did not specify the places where she was raised. She said: "Military family — not raised in any place for too long." Overall, 15 men (19%) and one woman mentioned other countries as places in which they were raised. The following is a list of all the different states and countries mentioned by the participants as places where they were raised:

<u>State/Country</u>	<u>No. of Men (80)</u>	<u>No. of Women (11)</u>
California	12=15%	3=27%
Florida	8=10%	3
New York	7= 9%	1= 9%
Ohio	7	
Germany	6= 8%	1
Virginia	5= 6%	1
Pennsylvania	4= 5%	2=18%
Texas	4	1
Iowa	4	
Connecticut	3= 4%	1
Minnesota	3	1
Arizona	3	
Canada	3	
Kansas	3	
Louisiana	3	
Maine	2	1
Maryland	3	
Massachusetts	3	
New Jersey	3	
Oklahoma	3	
South Dakota	3	
Washington	3	
Colorado		2
Georgia	2	
Indiana	2	
Nebraska	2	
North Carolina	2	
Oregon	2	
South Carolina	2	
United Kingdom	2	
Wisconsin	2	
Alaska	1	
Australia	1	
Cuba	1	
Finland	1	
Illinois		1
Japan	1	
Kentucky		1

Continued

<u>State/Country</u>	<u>No. of Men (80)</u>	<u>No. of Women (11)</u>
Michigan		1
Montana	1	
Sweden	1	
Vermont	1	

Less than a third of the participants grew up on a farm (question 70): 22 men (27%) and three women (27%). According to Kinsey *et al.* (1948), Gebhard *et al.* (1965), and Hunt (1974), bestiality is largely confined to farm boys. Again, the way the question was worded: “Did you grow up on a farm? Yes, No” did not provide any information about the number of participants who grew up in rural areas which were not considered farms.

Who Raised the Participants? (Questions 35-41)

The majority of men (59=69%) and women (10=91%) reported they were raised by both parents. The following table depicts the participants’ responses (these data are not mutually exclusive, since several participants had different family members involved in their up-bringing):

<u>Person(s) who Raised you</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Both Parents	59=69%	10=91%
Mother	13=16%	1= 9%
Grand Mother	8=10%	2=18%
Mother and Step-Father	6= 7%	
Grand Father	4= 5%	
Father and Step-Mother	3= 4%	

One man, in the “Both Parents” category, further related: “I was kidnaped by my father when I was six, and returned to my mother when I was 12.” Another man, in the “Mother” category, commented: “Mother raised me. She died when I was nine, and I was on my own since then (1935).” Two men, in the “Mother and Step-Father” category, reported their biological fathers took part in their up-bringing as well. One man, in the “Father and Step-Mother” category, clarified: “Age 1-3 father and mother. Age 3-9 neither. Age 9+ father and step-mother.” And one woman added: “Father’s brother babysat a lot, and I lived with mother’s brother some summers.”

With Whom did the Participants Spend Time? (Questions 42-49 and 56)

As expected, the majority of men (60=74%) and women (9=82%) reported they “primarily” or “somewhat” spent time with animals while growing up. Yet, 15 men (19%) and two women (18%) reported they did not spend much time with animals while growing up, and six other men (7%) reported they did not spend any time with animals while growing up. The following table depicts the men’s responses:

	<u>No. of Men Responding</u>	<u>Primarily and Somewhat</u>	<u>Not Too Much and Not At All</u>
Animals	81	60=74%	21=26%
Friends	81	57=70%	24=30%
Mother	42	32=76%	10=24%
Siblings	80	51=64%	29=36%
Both Parents	39	24=62%	15=38%
Extended Family	72	16=22%	56=78%
Father	41	9=22%	32=78%

One man reported he did not spend any time with his mother, and another man reported he did not spend any time with friends as a child. One man commented —

“(I) had neighbor kids, within half a mile, as friends (during) grades one to six. In junior high and highschool (I) had 15-20 close friends — church youth group and sports teams. We were a small rural school, about 12-16 students per class. We were all friends and did many things together.”

The majority of women reported they “somewhat” or “primarily” spent time with their parents and with animals while growing up. The following table depicts the women’s responses:

	No. of Women Responding	Primarily and Somewhat	Not Too Much and Not At All
Both Parents	6	5=83%	1=17%
Animals	11	9=82%	2=18%
Mother	5	4=80%	1=20%
Friends	11	7=64%	4=36%
Siblings	10	6=60%	4=40%
Extended Family	10	5=50%	5=50%
Father	5	1=20%	4=80%

Several participants provided further information about whom/what they spent time with while growing up. One man reported he spent a lot of time with his grandfather for the first nine years of his life, until the grandfather died. Another man spent time with cousins, and another with an elderly neighbor couple. One woman reported spending time with her paternal grandmother. Three men (4%) and one woman (9%) reported or implied that they were loners: “Books!!! My best friends!” “Leggos.” “Loner.” And “I spent a lot of time by myself reading, sewing, watching TV...”

Nine men reported they were emotionally abused by their peers because of being different. For example: “Many people made fun of me in school, so I tended to shy away from people. That’s how animals became a part of me.”

Knowledge of People who had Sex With Animals (Questions 86, and 273-274)

Thirty-seven men (45%) and one woman reported that while growing up, they knew or heard of people who had sex with animals. This means that 45 men (55%) and 10 women (91%) grew up not knowing anything about the phenomenon of bestiality/zoophilia, probably thinking they were the only ones. One man related: “(I) did not know any others until years later when friends who had computers showed and told me.”

Fourteen men (38% out of the 37 men) and the woman (at age 14.5) heard about peers who were having sex with animals. For example, “Boys who hung out at our farm...” “Teenage ‘rite of passage’.” And “People in school — guys in Future Farmers of America.” Twelve men heard stories and rumors about people who were having sex with animals: “Rumors of a high school boy with farm animals, which he did not deny to me on direct confrontation.” (These two categories, “Peers” and “Stories/Rumors,” were sometimes difficult to distinguish, and therefore may have overlapped).

Nine men reported they found out about people having sex with animals in books or newspaper articles or through viewing videos. For example —

— “At the age of 14-15, I learned implicitly that other people have sex with animals, first from reading Florida’s statutes regarding bestiality, and a little later explicitly from reading about convictions in various states for this ‘crime’.”

— “I recall Greek myths of Leda and swan, Persephone and bull etc. as very interesting. Also (read a) book on human sexuality (which) discussed zoophilia.”

— “... a friend had a tape of a girl having sex with a donkey.”

— “Read it in a porn book.” And —

— “Knew by reading Kinsey’s Report, age 13-14.”

One man reported he found out that people were having sex with animals by watching his aunt and cousin. Another man learned about bestiality/zoophilia “In a church sponsored sex education class.”

Overall, the men found out that other people have sex with animals at an average age of 18, with a standard deviation of 7.46, and a reported age range of 5.5 to 50 years of age (well beyond “while growing up”). The median is 16, and the mode is 12 years old. The women found out that other people have sex with animals at an average age of 25, with a standard deviation of 9.84, and a range of 14.5 to 47 years of age. The median is 20, and the mode is 18 years old.

Growing Up With Pets and Animals (Questions 48, 70, 72-73, and 300)

As mentioned before, Kinsey *et al.* (1948) state that animal sexual contacts are largely confined to farm boys, since they have access to animals. Davis (1954) relates that bestiality is frequent in places where man is constantly the companion of animals. This activity is often engaged in by children of rural areas, who discontinue the practice as they grow older. However, Davis (1954) notes, individuals found to practice bestiality in adult life do not have a rural background!

Although only 22 men (27%) and three women (27%) reported they grew up on a farm, all the women and almost all the men (76=93%) reported they had pets/animals while growing up. The majority of men (60=74%) and women (9=82%) reported they spent time “somewhat” or “primarily” with animals. Fifteen men (19%) and two women, however, reported they did not spend much time with animals while growing up, and six men (7%) reported they did not spend time with animals at all.

Sixty-three men (79%) reported their first association with animals was “as pets.” Twenty men (25%) reported they “had farm animals,” and 13 men (16%) reported their first association with animals was through “visiting other’s farm animals.” One man related that his first association with animals was “As other people’s pets,” and “Occasional pony riding...” and another man reported he had no association with animals as a child. One man commented: “As pets, we had farm animals, and as kids we went from farm to farm (all neighbors). If getting it on with animals happened to be the order of the day, we did it.”

It is important to note that previously 76 men (93%) reported they had pets/animals while growing up, while only 63 men (79%) reported their first association with animals was “as pets.” One man, who previously reported he had no pets while growing up, related (in question 300) that his first association with animals was “as pets.”

Ten women (91%) reported their first association with animals was “as pets,” although previously all women (100%) reported they had pets/animals while growing up. One of these women had both pets and farm animals. The 11th woman reported that her first association with animals was with “Other people’s pets.”

Most participants reported having had more than one pet/animal. The majority of men (68=89%) and women (10=91%) reported they had canines while growing up, and 49 men (64%) and nine women (82%) reported having had felines. The following table represents the animals/pets the participants reported having while growing up (one man and one woman reported they had “farm stock” but did not elaborate which specific animals were on their farm):

<u>Animal/Pets</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Canines	68=89%	10=91%
Felines	49=64%	9=82%
Fowls (chicken, birds, ducks, geese)	18=24%	4=36%
Equines	16=21%	4=36%
Rodents (hamsters, guinea pigs, mice, rats, gerbils, rabbits, squirrels, ground hog)	13=17%	3=27%
Bovines	13=17%	2=18%

Continued

<u>Animal/Pets</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Swine	13=17%	1= 9%
Reptiles (snakes, iguana, horned toad, turtles, lizards)	9=12%	2=18%
Fish	8=11%	2=18%
Goats	8=11%	0
Sheep	6= 7%	1= 9%
Mustelids (skunk, raccoon)	3= 4%	0

As this table shows, almost all participants reported growing up with dogs (68 men=89% and 10 women=91%). In questions 243-260, we can see that indeed, canines were the most popular reported animal sex partners in this sample. However, the rest of these two lists (“the popular animal sex partners” list and “the animals/pets the participants grew up with” list) does not seem to correlate.

As some authors point out, the individual’s constant proximity and familiarity with animals (Allen, 1979; Bledsoe, 1965; Bloch, 1933; Cerrone, 1991; Davis, 1954; Ellis in Masters, 1966, in Masters, 1962 & in Niemoeller, 1946b; Kinsey *et al.*, 1948; Ronsenfeld, 1967), and the sight of their sexual activity (Bloch, 1933; Love, 1992; Nagaraja, 1983), may be contributing factors in bestiality. Yet, it turns out that most participants reported having had more than one pet/animal while growing up, as well as being attracted to several species at the same time.

The fact that dogs were reported by the participants as the most popular pet as well as the most popular animal sex partner does not necessarily mean there is a cause-and-effect relationship between the two factors. Dogs are readily available and very popular as pets. However, it does not seem as though having dogs as pets would make one more susceptible to becoming sexually oriented toward them. Hopefully, future studies will confirm this.

The following is a related comment made by one of the participants: “I grew up in a small town, and although the countryside was only a few minutes walk away, we never kept the kind of animals that I was deeply attracted to.”

CHAPTER 10

THE PARTICIPANTS' SEXUAL HISTORY (Not Related to Bestiality/Zoophilia)

Sexual Education (Questions 78-86 and 89-102)

The majority of both men and women reported they learned about sexual matters from books and from their peers. The following table depicts the men's responses regarding how much they learned from various sources of information about sexual matters:

Source of Information:	No. of Men Responding	Primarily and Somewhat	Not Too Much and Not At All
Books	82	59=72%	23=28%
Peers	82	55=67%	27=33%
Magazines	82	43=52%	39=48%
First female sexual relationship	81	38=47%	43=53%
Classes at school	82	28=34%	54=66%
Mother	82	24=29%	58=71%
First male sexual relationship	75	19=25%	56=75%
Father	82	17=21%	65=79%
Other relatives	80	12=15%	68=85%
Television	80	10=13%	70=88%
Brother(s)	71	9=13%	62=87%
Sister(s)	78	8=10%	70=90%
Doctor, nurse, or clinic	79	2= 3%	77=97%
Radio	80	1= 1%	79=99%

The following table depicts the women's responses regarding how much the learned from various sources of information about sexual matters:

Source of Information:	No. of Women Responding	Primarily and Somewhat	Not Too Much and Not At All
Books	11	7=64%	4= 36%
Peers	11	7	4
First male sexual relationship	11	7	4
Classes at school	11	5=45%	6= 55%
First female sexual relationship	10	4=40%	6= 60%
Mother	11	4=36%	7= 64%
Magazines	11	2=18%	9= 82%
Brother(s)	9	1=11%	8= 89%
Sister(s)	9	1=11%	8= 89%
Television	11	1= 9%	10= 91%
Father	11	0	11=100%
Doctor, nurse, or clinic	11	0	11=100%
Radio	11	0	11=100%
Other relatives	10	0	10=100%

The men reported they learned about sexual matters between the ages of 8 and 14. They learned about sex with animals somewhere in that age range (12 years of age), but they learned about other people having sex with animals at a later age (18). The women reported a smaller age range for when they learned about sexual matters (10-12 years of age). They first learned about sex with animals later than the men (16 years of age), and

even later about other people having sex with animals (25). The following table depicts the ages at which the men first learned about sexual matters:

	No. of Men Responding	Mean Age	SD	Minimum Age	Maximum Age	Median	Mode
Pregnancy	78	8.15	3.13	2	18	8	6
Sexual intercourse	78	9.78	2.97	4	18.5	10	8
Masturbation	79	10.13	2.74	3	16	10	10
Orgasm	79	10.90	3.90	6	27	11	12
Menstruation	78	11.95	3.16	3	27	12	10
Sex with animals	76	12.38	2.79	3	18	12	12
Homosexuality	78	12.58	4.01	5	30	12	11
The clitoris	76	14.16	4.15	7	30	14	12
Other people who have sex with animals	76	17.92	7.46	5.5	50	16	12

The following table depicts the ages in which the women first learned about sexual matters:

	No. of Women Responding	Mean Age	SD	Minimum Age	Maximum Age	Median	Mode
Pregnancy	10	9.80	2.73	5	13.5	10.5	11
Menstruation	10	9.90	1.10	8	11	10	11
Masturbation	10	10.40	3.06	3	13	11.5	12
Orgasm	10	10.50	2.99	3	13	11.5	12
Sexual intercourse	10	10.60	1.71	7	13	11	11
The clitoris	9	12.06	1.88	10	16	12	11
Homosexuality	9	13.61	1.76	11	17	13	13
Sex with animals	10	15.90	11.21	9	47	12.5	11
Other people who have sex with animals	11	24.95	9.84	14.5	47	20	18

First Orgasm (Question 87)

The following table represents the participants' answers to the question "How did you experience your first orgasm?":

	Men (80)	Women (11)
Through masturbation	63=79%	8=73%
During sleep	9=11%	
Through animal contact	3= 4%	1= 9%
Through human homosexual contact	2= 3%	
Spontaneously	1= 1%	1
While petting with a human of the other gender	1	
Through human heterosexual intercourse	1	
Other		1

The woman who responded with "other" commented: "I'm not sure I've even had one (orgasm)."

First Masturbation (Question 88)

As was mentioned above, the majority of men (63=79%) and women (8=73%) reported they experienced their first orgasm through masturbation. The following depicts the participants' reports about their age the first time they masturbated:

	Average Age	SD	Minimum Age	Maximum Age	Median	Mode
Men (82)	11.01	2.59	5	16	11.75	12
Women (10)	10.80	2.86	3	13	12	12

First Heterosexual Intercourse (Questions 150-151)

Sixty-seven men and nine women reported having had sexual intercourse with a person of the other gender. The following depicts the participants’ reports about their age the first time they had intercourse:

	Average Age	SD	Minimum Age	Maximum Age	Median	Mode
Men (67)	17.66	5.85	4	30	18	19
Women (9)	17.56	3.61	14	25	17	17

The participants were then asked to describe the relationship they had with that person. The following table depicts their responses:

Type of Relationship	Men (65)	Women (10)
A friend, girlfriend, fiancé, or first wife	40=62%	9=90%
A friend of a friend, a friend of a sister, or a friend of a cousin	5= 8%	
An acquaintance, a neighbor, or a date	5= 8%	
A cousin	4= 6%	1=10%
A prostitute	4= 6%	
A stranger	3= 5%	
A sister	2= 3%	
Mother (when he was 6)	1= 1%	
A 28 year old student who lived/boarded with the family (when he was 13)	1= 1%	

Number of Heterosexual Partners (Question 152)

Question 152, revealed the relative high number of heterosexual partners the participants reported. The following table depicts the participants’ responses to the question: “Counting your first partner, with how many different people have you had heterosexual sexual relations? (Not restricted to intercourse)”:

	Average No.	SD	Minimum No.	Maximum No.	Median	Mode
Men (81)	61	390.32	0 (9 men)	3500	4	2 (15 men)
Women (10)	48	63.30	3	200	21	3 (2 women)

First Homosexual Contact (Questions 158-159)

A surprisingly high number of men (63=77%), in question 158, reported they have had sexual contact with men. This number supposedly includes abuse incidents, although five men who reported about being sexually abused by males, did not mention their abusers as their first contact with a person of their gender (in question 159). The women follow the same pattern: Eight women (73%) reported they have had sexual contact with another woman. The following table depicts the participants’ responses about how old they were the first time they had homosexual sexual contact:

	Average Age	SD	Minimum Age	Maximum Age	Median	Mode
Men (63)	15.82	9.51	4 (2 men)	44	12	13 (5 men)
Women (8)	19.31	7.83	9.5	36	19	19

They were then asked about the relationship they had with that person. The following table depicts their responses:

Type of Relationship	Men (63)	Women (8)
A friend	37=59%	4=50%
A stranger (including one man who did it as part of a “prostitution trick.” The women’s sexual experience was forced)	7=11%	1=13%
A cousin	6=10%	
An acquaintance or a neighbor	4= 6%	3=38%
Two partners (a nephew and a neighbor boy, and an older neighbor and an older brother — not included in other categories)	2= 3%	
A brother or step-brother	2	
Father (when they were 4 and 9 years old)	2	
Uncle	1= 2%	
Father’s friend	1	
Sister’s husband	1	

It is important to note that one man who reported that his first sexual experience was with a male cousin, in subsequent questions did not acknowledge having had sex with males. Another man reported he had never had sexual contact with a male, yet in subsequent questions he reported that a male family friend had touched his genitals before the age of puberty, and that he enjoyed it very much when a human male performed fellatio on him.

Number of Homosexual Partners (Question 160)

The following table depicts the participants’ responses to the question: “Counting your first partner, with how many different people have you had homosexual sexual relations?”:

	Average No.	SD	Minimum No.	Maximum No.	Median	Mode
Men (80)	8	18.67	0 (18 men)	100	2	0
Women (11)	8	13.03	0 (3 women)	45	4	0

Childhood Abuse and Incest (Questions 55-58 and 103-149)

As mentioned before, Ramsis (1969) proposes that most people who engage in bestiality share a common theme of sexual unhappiness. According to Ramsis’ theory, often unpleasant initial sexual experiences motivated these people to seek pleasure with animals. Once they become sexually involved with an animal, their pursuits become an obsession. When the participants in this study were asked about childhood abuse, the following were their responses:

	Emotional Abuse	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse
Men (78)	33=42%		
Women (11)	5=45%		
Men (77)		16=21%	
Women (11)		3=27%	
Men (78)			13=17%
Women (10)			3=30%

When the participants were asked to describe their abuse, it turned out that 36 men (46%) rather than 33, were emotionally abused. Among them, nine men described emotional abuse received from their peers because of being different. For example: “Many people made fun of me in school, so I tended to shy away from people. That’s how animals became a part of me.”

Three women responded positively to the question: “Before the age of puberty, did anyone, who was at least five years older than you, touch you sexually?” All three women reported the sexual touching consisted of fondling the genitals. One woman was molested by two uncles starting at age five. One woman was molested by a male family friend/acquaintance and later by an older friend. The third woman (participant G=7) reported previously that her father physically and sexually abused her. However, she did not mention him in subsequent questions where she was requested to point out who was the person abusing her. She did report, however, she had sexual relations with her brother when she was 36! Another woman reported she had sexual relations with her brother, starting at age seven, and another woman related she was molested before the age of puberty by a male stranger.

In other words, although only three women originally reported (in question 57) that they were sexually abused during childhood, it appears that four women (36%) were sexually molested during childhood (in two cases the abuse was incestuous — two uncles in one case and a father in another) and two women had a “non-abusive” incestuous relationship with their brother (one at age 7 and the other at age 36).

Although only 13 men reported they were sexually abused as children, when asked specifically: “Before the age of puberty, did anyone, who was at least five years older than you, touch you sexually?” 31 men (38%) answered “yes.” This was not surprising since men tend to be reluctant to disclose their victimization because admitting it may be a threat to their masculinity. They may, therefore, find it psychologically more convenient to interpret any sexual encounter as a positive experience, especially if it is a heterosexual act (Miletski, 1995). The following is a summary of what the men described regarding their sexual abuse and incestuous relations:

- A=1: Engaged in fondling of the genitals, passive oral sex, and anal intercourse with a female relative.
- G=7: Engaged in fondling of the genitals, and active oral sex with his step father’s nephew.
- H=8: Was fondled by two older male friends.
- J=10: Engaged in fondling, mutual oral sex, and anal intercourse with his father, starting at age nine.
- L=12: Engaged in kissing and fondling of the genitals by an older male friend and an older brother, starting at age 10. At 11 he engaged in similar behaviors with his sister.
- N=14: Engaged in kissing, fondling of the genitals, passive oral sex, and anal intercourse with his father, starting at age four, and with his mother, including vaginal intercourse, starting at age six.
- O=15: Was sexually fondled by a female family friend/acquaintance, a female relative, an older friend, and his mother. This man had previously reported that his father sexually abused him, but he did not mention it again in subsequent answers about sexual touching before puberty. When asked about any sexual relations with family members, this participant only noted that he had sexual relations with his sister, starting when he was six years old.

Understanding Bestiality and Zoophilia

- R=18: Was fondled by an older friend. At 34 he also had a sexual relation with a cousin, who later became his second wife.
- T=20: Was fondled and received oral sex from an older female friend.
- U=21: Was fondled by a male teacher while in seventh grade.
- X=24: Related that he has a vague memory of two “school boys ‘pants’ me when I was four years old, no violence.” He also had a sexual relation with his brother, starting at age 11.
- AA=27: Performed oral sex and had anal intercourse with two older brothers, starting at age four, and later with an older male friend/neighbor. He had his first vaginal intercourse at 13 with a 28-year-old female friend/acquaintance. He also reported having a sexual relationship with two cousins, starting at ages four and five, and with his little sister, when he was nine years old.
- AD=30: Was fondled by a male clergyman.
- AE=31: Was fondled by a male family friend/acquaintance.
- AF=32: Engaged in kissing, fondling and mutual oral sex with two older male friends, a female family friend/acquaintance, and two male family friends.
- AH=34: Engaged in kissing, fondling, and giving oral sex with two male strangers. He reported: “I have memory fragments in which I think I was being sexually abused, but the memories are so brief and painful, I cannot confirm my suspicion.” He also had sexual relations with his brother, starting at age 10, and with a nephew, when he was 14.
- AI=35: “Was forced to give oral sex to an older boy,” (a family friend/acquaintance) who also “forced me to have oral sex with a dog.” He also engaged in fondling, mutual oral sex, and anal sex with another male family friend. This man had also engaged in sexual relations with his niece, starting at age 13, and with his nephew, starting at age 14.
- AP=42: Engaged in fondling and mutual oral sex with the family’s female maid, three older male friends, and a male stranger. With the males, he reported, “(we also) rubbed our penises on each other’s butts.” This participant also had sexual relations with his niece when he was 17.
- AT=46: Engaged in kissing, fondling and vaginal intercourse with a female relative and two male relatives. He also had a sexual relationship with a cousin, starting at age seven.
- AV=48: Was fondled, received oral sex and anal sex from his uncle, starting at age seven, and his father, starting at age nine. He also engaged in sexual relations with his brother and sister, starting at age 11.
- AX=50: Engaged in kissing, fondling of the genitals, and mutual oral sex with three female babysitters, an older female friend, and five female family friends/acquaintances.
- BC=55: Engaged in fondling of the genitals with an older brother and an older sister. This man, later on, answered “no” to the question if he ever had sexual relations with a close member of his family.
- BE=57: Engaged in fondling and mutual oral sex with a female cousin, starting at age seven, and with a male stranger. He also had a sexual relation with his brother, starting at age eight.
- BF=58: Engaged in fondling and mutual oral sex with two male relatives, yet he did not mention them when asked about sexual relations with family members. This participant, in subsequent questions about his sexual behavior, reported the only sexual behavior he ever engaged in has been bestiality.
- BH=60: Engaged in fondling of the genitals with a male family friend.

- BN=66: Reported engaging in fondling, passive oral sex, vaginal (?) and anal intercourse with eight male family friends/acquaintances. He also had a sexual relationship with a cousin, starting at age seven.
- BO=67: “Had items shoved up my anus, my penis pulled by rope, and one time tied down and sodomized by my older sister’s husband.”
- BP=68: Engaged in fondling of the genitals with an older male friend.
- BS=71: Reported he “was forced to suck a man’s penis after he sucked mine. He was my dad’s friend. I never told anyone. Too scared.”
- BT=72: Engaged in fondling, mutual oral sex, vaginal and anal intercourse with an older male friend, a female relative, a female stranger, and a male stranger. He also reported, in subsequent questions that he had sexual relations with a cousin, starting at age 12, an aunt, starting at age 15, a sister-in-law, when he was 18, and with his daughter, when this participant was 35 years old.
- CB=80: Was kissed and fondled by his grandmother.

Aside from these 31 men’s reports, another participant (E=5) related: “There was no touching, but (my uncle) wanted me to watch (him masturbating). Happened once.”

It is important to note a discrepancy in participant BX=76's report about his abuse. When asked to describe his abuse, he related that “from age 11 to 15 (I) was forced into sexual pleasures of others which has... my life to this day.” Nevertheless, in subsequent questions he reported that no one who was at least five years older touched him in a sexual way before the age of puberty.

When taking into account the broad definition of childhood sexual abuse, which means engaging in any sexual behavior or subjecting a child to a sexual behavior with or by a person who is at least five years older than the child, it appears that 33 men (40%), rather than 13, were sexually abused. This is an alarming number. Yet, It is important to note that since this was a descriptive study with no control group, no cause-and-effect relationship between sexual abuse and bestiality/zoophilia can be established.

Twenty-nine men (35%) reported they had sexual relations with a close member of their family. The incestuous relationships of 15 of these 29 men were already reported above, including seven other cases which the participants did not regard as sexual relations with a close family member: participant A=1 engaged in sexual behavior with a female relative, participant E=5 watched an uncle masturbate, participant G=7 engaged in a sexual relationship with his step father’s nephew, participant BC=55 with a brother and a sister, participant BF=58 with two male relatives, participant BO=67 was sexually abused by his brother-in-law, and participant CB=80 was fondled by his grandmother. When adding these seven men to the 29 who responded positively to the question about sexual relations with a close member of their family, the number becomes 36. This means that almost half (44%) of the men have had some sort of sexual relations with a close family member. The following is a summary of incestuous relationships as they were described by 22 of the men:

- A=1: Engaged in fondling of the genitals, passive oral sex, and anal intercourse with a **female relative**.
- E=5: “There was no touching, but (my **uncle**) wanted me to watch (him masturbating). Happened once.”
- G=7: Engaged in fondling of the genitals, and active oral sex with his **step father’s nephew**.
- J=10: Engaged in fondling, mutual oral sex, and anal intercourse with his **father**, starting at age nine.
- L=12: Engaged in kissing and fondling of the genitals by an older **brother**, starting at age 10. At 11 he engaged in similar behaviors with his **sister**.
- N=14: Engaged in kissing, fondling of the genitals, passive oral sex, and anal intercourse with his **father**, starting at age four, and with his **mother**, including vaginal intercourse, starting at age six.
- O=15: Was sexually fondled by a **female relative** and by his **mother**. This man had previously reported that his **father** sexually abused him, but he did not mention it again in subsequent answers about

- sexual touching before puberty. When asked about any sexual relations with family members, this participant only noted that he had sexual relations with his **sister**, starting when he was six years old.
- R=18: At 34 he also had a sexual relation with a **cousin**, who later became his second wife.
- X=24: Had a sexual relation with his **brother**, starting at age 11.
- AA=27: Performed oral sex and had anal intercourse with two older **brothers**, starting at age four. He also reported having a sexual relationship with two **cousins**, starting at ages four and five, and his little **sister**, when he was nine years old.
- AH=34: Had a sexual relation with his **brother**, starting at age 10, and with a **nephew**, when he was 14.
- AI=35: Had sexual relations with his **niece**, starting at age 13, and with his **nephew**, starting at age 14.
- AP=42: Had sexual relations with his **niece** when he was 17.
- AT=46: Engaged in kissing, fondling and vaginal intercourse with a **female relative** and two **male relatives**. He also had a sexual relationship with a **cousin**, starting at age seven.
- AV=48: Was fondled, received oral sex and anal sex from his **uncle**, starting at age seven, and from his **father**, starting at age nine. He also engaged in sexual relations with his **brother** and **sister**, starting at age 11.
- BC=55: Engaged in fondling of the genitals with an older **brother** and an older **sister** (this man, later on, answered “no” to the question if he ever had sexual relations with a close member of his family).
- BE=57: Engaged in fondling and mutual oral sex with a **female cousin**, starting at age seven. Also had a sexual relation with his **brother**, starting at age eight.
- BF=58: Engaged in fondling and mutual oral sex with two **male relatives**, yet he did not mention them when asked about sexual relations with family members (this participant, in subsequent questions about his sexual behavior, reported the only sexual behavior he ever engaged in has been bestiality).
- BN=66: Had a sexual relationship with a **cousin**, starting at age seven.
- BO=67: “Had items shoved up my anus, my penis pulled by rope, and one time tied down and sodomized by my older **sister’s husband**.”
- BT=72: Engaged in fondling, mutual oral sex, vaginal and anal intercourse with a **female relative**. He also had sexual relations with a **cousin**, starting at age 12, an **aunt**, starting at age 15, a **sister-in-law**, when he was 18, and with his **daughter**, when this participant was 35 years old.
- CB=80: Was kissed and fondled by his **grandmother**.

In some cases, as you can see in the list above, the incestuous relations were simply sexual play between individuals of the same age, thus not considered sexual abuse. The following represents the familial relationships the 36 men and the four women who reported having had sexual contact with a family member, had with that family member (these data are not mutually exclusive):

<u>Familial Relationship</u>	<u>Men (82)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Sister(s)	13=15%	
Cousin(s) — no gender distinction was made	13=15%	
Brother(s) or Step-Brother	8=10%	2=18%
Father	4= 5%	1= 9%
Niece(s)	3= 4%	
Nephew(s)	3	
Uncle(s)	2= 2%	1= 9%

Continued

Familial Relationship	Men (82)	Women (11)
Mother	2	
Grandmother	1=1%	
Aunt	1	
Daughter	1	
Brother-in-law	1	
Sister-in-law	1	
Step Father's Nephew	1	

The following table summarizes the analysis of the data on abuse and incest incidences among the 82 men and 11 women:

	Emotional Abuse	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Overall Incest
Men	36=44%	16=20%	33=40%	36=44%
Women	5=45%	3=27%	4=36%	3=27%

These statistics seem high, especially when it comes to the childhood sexual abuse of the men. In the literature, there are no conclusive data on the prevalence of sexually abused boys, and findings vary from three percent to more than 20 percent, depending on the definition of sexual abuse and the methodology (Miletski, 1995). In the current study, the statistics were compiled through both the participants' reports and my analysis of their accounts. I further used a very broad definition of childhood sexual abuse which contributed to the large number of sexually abused participants in this study.

It would be interesting to see how non-zoos would answer these same questions which would then be analyzed by utilizing the same broad definition of childhood sexual abuse. As a clinician and a group facilitator in human sexuality seminars, I see many people who have had incidents which fit the definition of childhood sexual abuse, yet they do not consider them as such. After questioning and awareness-building, many people will "remember" and report sexually abusive incidents in their past.

CHAPTER 11

PARTICIPANTS' CURRENT SEXUAL BEHAVIORS AND ATTITUDES

(Not Related to Bestiality/Zoophilia)

Current Masturbation (Questions 167-170)

The following table depicts the participants' reports about the frequency of their masturbation (one woman reported she has never masturbated to orgasm):

	Average per Week	SD	Minimum Frequency	Maximum Frequency	Median	Mode
Men (82)	5.37	5.67	0.06 (3 times a year)	25 times a week	3	2
Women (10)	1.61	1.12	0.5 (twice a month)	4 times a week	1.25	1

Sexual Fantasies (Questions 171-182)

The following table represents the men's reports about their favorite sexual fantasies:

Fantasy	No. of Men Responding	Always and Primarily	Sometimes	Rarely and Never
Having sex with animals	80	61=76%	14=18%	5= 6%
Watching other humans have sex with animals	78	27=35%	17=22%	34=44%
Having sex with a woman	79	22=28%	16=20%	41=52%
Watching two women have sex	76	6= 8%	10=13%	60=79%
Having sex with a man	77	6= 8%	14=18%	57=74%
Having sex with children	76	5= 7%	2= 3%	69=91%
Participating in group sex	76	4= 5%	11=14%	61=80%
Participating in sadomasochistic sex acts	76	3= 4%	10=13%	63=83%
Being raped by a human being	75	2= 3%	7= 9%	66=88%
Watching two men have sex	75	1= 1%	8=11%	66=88%

As it appears, the majority of men (61=76%) "primarily" or "always" fantasize about having sex with animals. This finding goes along with the theory of sexual orientation which claims that one would have sexual fantasies about the gender or, in this case, the species to which he/she is oriented. Three of the men who reported they do not fantasize about having sex with animals, reported in subsequent questions that they no longer engage in sexual relations with animals.

In addition, 23 men provided comments about their sexual fantasies. Nineteen of them described some sort of sexual activity related to animals, such as —

— "Fantasizing most often that I am the male animal mating with a female animal or human female. Almost exclusively use pictures of mating animals for lack of adequate erotica."

— "Helping/watching male and female animals have sex."

— "Sex with 'anthropomorphic' animals (furries) and/or intelligent animals."

— "Being raped by an animal." And —

— “Being a woman having sex with male animals. Being a male animal having sex with a woman. Being a female animal having sex with a male animal. I often fantasize that I am having oral sex with a bull while several women ‘fondle’ the bull to orgasm...”

Other sexual fantasies mentioned were: “golden showers” (two men), transsexualism— being a woman (two men), pedophilia (two men), transvestism and exhibitionism (one man), and one man wrote that he likes to fantasize about killing animals.

The women did not report having many fantasies. Nevertheless, the same pattern as the men’s occurred for the women as well. The following table represents the women’s responses to the question “What do you fantasize about when you masturbate or when you have other sexual relations?”

Fantasy	No. of Women Responding	Always and Primarily	Sometimes	Rarely and Never
Having sex with animals	11	5=45%	5=45%	1= 9%
Watching other humans have sex with animals	10	4=40%	5=50%	1=10%
Having sex with a man	11	3=27%	4=36%	4=36%
Participating in group sex	11	0	6=55%	5=45%
Having sex with a woman	11	0	5=45%	6=55%
Participating in sadomasochistic sex acts	10	0	3=30%	7=70%
Watching two women have sex	10	0	2=20%	8=80%
Watching two men have sex	11	0	2=18%	9=82%
Being raped by a human being	10	0	1=10%	9=90%
Having sex with children	10	0	1=10%	9=90%

One woman commented that she likes to fantasize about having sex with two women, and another woman wrote that she likes to fantasize about: “Bondage (he passive), being ‘used’ by many men, being ‘on stage,’ ‘water sports’ and scatology (active and passive). I’ve done some, would like to try more of all.”

Sexual Activities (Questions 183-206)

The participants were asked about their participation in various sexual activities, and how they felt about them. The following table depicts the men’s responses about the sexual activities in which they have engaged:

Sexual Activity	No. of Men Responding	Have Done It	Have Not Done It
Sex with animals	81	81=100%	0
Using any type of pornography/erotica	81	79= 98%	2= 2%
Using bestiality-related pornography	81	74= 91%	7= 9%
Human heterosexual intercourse	82	68= 83%	14=17%
Seeing other people doing sexual things	80	61= 76%	19=24%
Performing oral sex on a human female	82	62= 76%	20=24%
Oral sex performed by a human female on you	82	61= 74%	21=26%
Oral sex performed by a human male on you	81	55= 68%	26=32%
Performing oral sex on a human male	80	48= 60%	32=40%
Performing anal sex on a human partner	81	42= 52%	39=48%
Receiving anal sex from a human partner	80	38= 48%	42=53%
Human group sex	81	22= 27%	59=74%
Exposing your sexual parts	80	20= 25%	60=75%
Watching a live animals sex show	77	19= 25%	58=75%
Cross-dressing	78	15= 19%	63=81%
Being forced into doing something sexually that you did not want to do	80	13= 16%	67=84%

Continued

Sexual Activity	No. of Men Responding	Have Done It	Have Not Done It
Sex with children	79	8=10%	71=90%
Forcing someone to do something sexually that he/she did not want to do	80	7= 9%	73=91%
Being raped	79	5= 6%	74=94%
Raping another human being	78	2= 3%	76=97%

As can be seen from this table, all men had sex with animals (the dependent variable). Fourteen men (17%) reported they never had sexual intercourse with a woman. Thirty-eight men (48%) reported they have received anal sex from a human partner — it is important to note that anal sex can be performed by females as well as by males; women can insert fingers and other objects into the anus and thus perform anal sex on men and women. Thirteen men (16%) reported they were forced into doing something sexual they did not want to do. Seven men (9%) reported they have forced someone to do something sexual he/she did not want to do, and two men admitted to raping another human being. Sixty one men (76%) reported they have seen other people doing sexual things — this question was supposed to screen for voyeurism, yet it seems that the participants misunderstood the meaning of “seeing other people doing sexual things,” thus their responses did not really reveal much. Twenty men (25%) engaged in exhibitionism, 15 men (20%) engaged in cross-dressing, and eight men (10%) reported they had sex with children (who were at least five years younger than the participants at the time).

The majority of men enjoyed having sex with animals, watching a live animals sex show, having intercourse with women, and using bestiality-related pornography. The following table depicts the men’s responses about how much they enjoyed each of the above sexual activities (obviously, the number of participants who engaged in any particular sexual activity makes a difference when calculating the percentage of those who enjoyed that activity):

Sexual Activity	No. of Men Participated	Enjoyed It Very Much and Somewhat		Didn’t Like It and Hated It
		Enjoyed It	It Was OK	
Sex with animals	81	79=98%	2= 2%	0
Watching a live animals sex show	19	17=89%	2=11%	0
Human heterosexual intercourse	68	55=81%	10=15%	3= 4%
Using bestiality-related pornography	74	59=80%	10=14%	5= 7%
Sex with children	8	6=75%	2=25%	0
Oral sex performed by a human female on you	61	45=74%	11=18%	5= 8%
Performing anal sex on a human partner	42	31=74%	5=12%	6=14%
Receiving anal sex from a human partner	38	26=68%	7=18%	5=13%
Using any type of pornography/erotica	79	51=65%	24=30%	4= 5%
Performing oral sex on a human female	62	40=65%	10=16%	12=19%
Cross-dressing	15	9=60%	4=27%	2=13%
Being raped	5	3=60%	1=20%	1=20%
Human group sex	22	13=59%	6=27%	3=14%
Seeing other people doing sexual things	61	36=59%	19=31%	6=10%
Oral sex performed by a human male on you	55	30=55%	17=31%	8=15%
Performing oral sex on a human male	48	26=54%	11=23%	11=23%
Exposing your sexual parts	20	10=50%	7=35%	3=15%
Raping another human being	2	1=50%	0	1=50%
Forcing someone to do something sexually he/she did not want to do	7	2=29%	2=29%	3=43%
Being forced into doing something sexually you did not want to do	13	2=15%	5=38%	6=46%

The following table depicts the 11 women’s responses about the different sexual activities in which they have engaged:

Sexual Activity	Have Done It	Have Not Done It
Sex with animals	11=100%	0
Human heterosexual intercourse	10= 91%	1= 9%
Oral sex performed by a human male on you	10	1
Performing oral sex on a human male	10	1
Receiving anal sex from a human partner	10	1
Using any type of pornography/erotica	10	1
Using bestiality-related pornography	9= 82%	2=18%
Seeing other people doing sexual things	9	2
Oral sex performed by a human female on you	7= 64%	4=36%
Performing oral sex on a human female	7	4
Exposing your sexual parts	7	4
Human group sex	5= 45%	6=55%
Performing anal sex on a human partner	4= 36%	7=64%
Being forced into doing something sexually you did not want to do	4	7
Being raped	4	7
Cross-dressing	3= 27%	8=73%
Watching a live animals sex show	1= 9%	10=91%
Sex with children	1	10

As can be seen from this table, the majority of women were involved in a variety of sexual activities. All women had sex with animals (the dependent variable). One woman reported she never had sexual intercourse with a man. Five women (45%) participated in group sex, four (36%) were raped, and one woman had sex with a child who was at least five years younger than she was at the time.

The majority of women reported to have enjoyed all the various sexual activities they have engaged in except for being forced into doing something sexually they did not want to do and being raped (which was probably the same activity, since the same four women responded to these two questions). The following table depicts the women’s responses about how much they enjoyed each of the above sexual activities (again, the number of participants who engaged in any particular sexual activity makes a difference when calculating the percentage of those who enjoyed that activity):

Sexual Activity	No. of Women Participated	Enjoyed It Very Much and Somewhat		Didn’t Like It and Hated It
		Enjoyed It	It Was OK	
Watching a live animals sex show	1	1=100%	0	0
Sex with children	1	1=100%	0	0
Sex with animals	11	10= 91%	1= 9%	0
Human heterosexual intercourse	10	9= 90%	1=10%	0
Oral sex performed by a human male on you	10	9= 90%	1=10%	0
Using bestiality-related pornography	9	8= 89%	1=11%	0
Oral sex performed by a human female on you	7	6= 86%	1=14%	0
Performing oral sex on a human female	7	6= 86%	0	1=14%
Performing oral sex on a human male	10	8= 80%	1=10%	1=10%
Using any type of pornography/erotica	10	8= 80%	2=20%	0
Human group sex	5	4= 80%	1=20%	0
Seeing other people doing sexual things	9	7= 78%	2=22%	0
Performing anal sex on a human partner	4	3= 75%	1=25%	0
Exposing your sexual parts	7	5= 71%	1=14%	1=14%

Continued

Sexual Activity	No. of Women Participated	Enjoyed It Somewhat	Enjoyed It Very Much and It Was OK	Didn't Like It and Hated It
Cross-dressing	3	2=67%	1=33%	0
Receiving anal sex from a human partner	10	6=60%	2=20%	2= 20%
Being forced into doing something sexually you did not want to do	4	0	0	4=100%
Being raped	4	0	0	4=100%

It is interesting to note that none of the men or the women reported he/she did not like his/her sexual contact with animals nor hated it.

Twenty-three men (28%) reported they have paid a woman for sex. One man paid another man for sex. Four men (5%) were paid by a woman for sex, and seven men (9%) were paid by a man for sex. One woman reported she paid another woman for sex, but none of the women paid a man for sex. One woman was paid by a woman for sex, and four women (36%) were paid by a man for sex.

Current Heterosexual Activities (Questions 153-157, 171, and 187-191)

As mentioned before, 22 men (28%) “always” or “primarily” fantasize about having sex with a woman, while 41 men (52%) “rarely” or “never” fantasize about it. Of the 68 men who had sexual intercourse with a woman, 55 (81%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while only three men (4%) reported they “did not like it” or they “hated” this activity.

Sixty-one men (74%) reported a woman performed fellatio on them. Forty-five of them (74%) “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while five men (8%) “did not like it.” Sixty-two men (76%) reported they have performed cunnilingus on a woman. Forty men (65%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while 12 men (19%) reported they “did not like it” or they “hated it.”

Three women (27%) “always” or “primarily” fantasize about having sex with a man, while four women (36%) “rarely” do so. None of the 11 women reported she “never” fantasizes about having sex with a man.

Nine out of the 10 women who had sexual intercourse with a man (90%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it.” The other woman only said “it was O.K..” Ten women (91%) reported that a man performed cunnilingus on them. Nine of them “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while the other woman said “it was O.K..” Ten women also reported they performed fellatio on a man. Eight of them (80%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” one woman thought “it was O.K.,” and another woman reported she “did not like” doing that.

The following table depicts the participants’ responses to the question: “During the past year, with how many different people of the other gender have you had sexual contact?”:

	Average No.	SD	Minimum No.	Maximum No.	Median	Mode
Men (82)	1.59	3.51	0 (38 men)	25	1	0
Women (11)	1.82	1.72	0 (3 women)	5	1	1 (3 women)

The participants were then asked about the frequency of heterosexual sexual relations in the past year. Although in the table above 38 men reported they have not had sexual contact with women in the past year, here, 39 men reported not having sex with women in the past year. In other words, 39 men (48%) and three women (27%) have not had heterosexual sexual relations in the past year. The following are the participants’ responses:

	Average per Week	SD	Minimum Frequency	Maximum Frequency	Median	Mode
Men (43)	1.16	1.58	Once a year	Once a day	1.52 a month	Once a year
Women (8)	1.53	1.90	Once a year	5 times a week	0.54 a week	3 times a week

It turned out that 43 men and eight women seem to have had, on average, steady heterosexual relationships at the time of the study.

Current Homosexual Activities (Questions 10-13, 18-19, 161-166, 172-174, and 188-193)

As mentioned before, six men reported they were having an intimate relationship with a human male at the time of the study, and two men (in question 10) or three (in question 18) reported living with their human male lovers. Six men (8%) reported they “always” or “primarily” fantasize about having sex with another man, while 57 men (74%) reported they “never” or “rarely” fantasize about having sex with another man. Only one man related that he “primarily” fantasizes about watching two men have sex, while 66 men (88%) reported they “never” or “rarely” fantasize about it.

Fifty-five men (68%) reported they had another man perform fellatio on them. More than half of them (30=55%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or they “somewhat enjoyed it,” while eight men (15%) reported they “did not like it” or they “hated it.” Forty-eight men (60%) performed fellatio on another man. Again, more than half of them (26=54%) “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while 11 men (23%) reported they “did not like it” or they “hated it.”

The following table depicts the men’s responses to the question: “During the past year, with how many different people of your gender have you had sexual contact?”:

	Average No.	SD	Minimum No.	Maximum No.	Median	Mode
Men (81)	1.02	2.69	0 (52 men)	20	0	0

The participants were then asked about the frequency of homosexual contact in the past year. The following are the men’s responses:

	Average per Week	SD	Minimum Frequency	Maximum Frequency	Median	Mode
Men (29)	0.31 (1.24 per month)	0.41	Once a year (8 men)	1.5 per week	4.81 per year	Once a Year

None of the women reported she had an intimate relationship with a human female lover at the time of the study. None of the women reported that she “always” or “primarily” fantasizes about having sex with another woman, while six women (55%) reported they “rarely” or “never” fantasize about it. None of the women further reported that she “always” or “primarily” fantasizes about watching two women have sex, while eight women (80%) reported they “rarely” or “never” fantasize about it. One woman, however, commented that she likes to fantasize about having sex with two women.

Seven women (64%) reported they had another woman perform cunnilingus on them. Six of them (86%) “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while the other woman did not mind it (“it was O.K.”). Seven women also performed cunnilingus on another woman. Six “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” but the other woman reported she “did not like it.”

During the past year, only one woman reported having sexual contact with another woman. The frequency of that contact had been twice a month, or every other week.

The participants were asked to rate themselves on the Kinsey scale, and to take into consideration both actual behaviors and fantasy. Interestingly enough, although 63 men and eight women reported they had homosexual sexual relationships, the majority of men (57=72%) and women (8=73%) rated themselves as

heterosexually inclined (between 0 and 2) on the Kinsey scale. The following table depicts the participants' responses:

Sexual Inclination	Men (79)	Women (11)
0=Exclusively heterosexual	18=23%	3=27%
1=Only incidental homosexuality	24=30%	1= 9%
2=Both heterosexual and homosexual, but more heterosexual	15=19%	4=36%
3=Equally homosexual and heterosexual	6= 8%	3=27%
4=Both homosexual and heterosexual, but more homosexual	11=14%	0
5=Only incidental heterosexuality	4= 5%	0
6=Exclusively homosexual	1= 1%	0

Paraphilias (Questions 67, 176-179, 182, 195-197, and 199-203)

As mentioned before, two men (2%) reported they were diagnosed with paraphilic disorders. One of them was diagnosed with Exhibitionism and Voyeurism Disorders, and the other reported he only knew he was diagnosed with having sexual problems. He commented that he likes to fantasize about transvestism and exhibitionism. None of the women reported having been diagnosed with a paraphilic diagnosis.

However, other questions about the participants' sexual fantasies and actual sexual behaviors revealed more information about other possible not-diagnosed paraphilias:

Pedophilia — Five men (7%) “primarily” and two women (3%) “sometimes” fantasize about having sex with children. Two men further commented that they like fantasies about pedophilia. Eight men (10%) and one woman reported they had sex with children who were at least five years younger than the participants were at that time. Five of the men (63%) and the woman reported they “enjoyed it very much,” one man “somewhat enjoyed it,” and the other two men reported “it was O.K..”

Sado-Masochism — Three men (4%) reported they “always” or “primarily” fantasize about participating in sadomasochistic sex acts. Eleven men (14%) and three women (30%) reported they “sometimes” fantasize about participating in sadomasochistic sex acts. Two men (3%) reported “primarily” fantasizing about being raped by a human being, and seven men (9%) and one woman (10%) reported they “sometimes” fantasize about it. Two men (3%) reported they “sometimes” fantasize about raping a human being. Two men further commented that they like to fantasize about “golden showers,” and one woman related she likes to fantasize about “Bondage (he passive), being ‘used’ by many men, being ‘on stage,’ ‘water sports’ and scatology (active and passive).”

When it came to actual behaviors, (in question 195) seven men (9%) reported they forced someone to do something sexually he/she did not want to do. One of them reported he “enjoyed it very much,” another “somewhat enjoyed it,” two reported “it was O.K.,” and the other three men reported they “hated it.” In question 200, two men (3%) reported they raped another human being. One reported he “enjoyed it very much,” and the other “hated it.”

Thirteen men (16%) and four women (36%) reported they were forced into doing something sexual they did not want to do. Two of the men (15%) reported they “enjoyed it very much,” and another five men reported “it was O.K.” (all four women and the other six men reported they “did not like it” or they “hated it”). Five men (6%) and the same four women reported they were raped. Surprisingly, one man reported he “enjoyed it very much,” two “somewhat enjoyed it,” and one man reported “it was O.K.” (the fifth man and all four women reported they “did not like it” or they “hated it”).

One man reported he likes to fantasize about killing animals, and then goes on to report he actually tortures and kills animals as part of his sexual act with them (more about this man later).

Transvestism (Cross-Dressing) — Other than the man who commented (in question 182) that he likes to fantasize about transvestism and exhibitionism, 15 men (19%) and three women (27%) reported they have cross-dressed. This seems to be a high number for the men, and a surprising number for the women, since women, in our society, can generally wear men’s clothes without thinking twice about it. Nine men (60%) and

two women (67%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it.” Four men and the third woman reported “it was O.K.” The other two men reported they “did not like it.” It is possible that some of the participants misunderstood the meaning of the term “cross-dressing,” thus their answers may not be accurate. Therefore, it is likely that the participants’ answers to this question do not reflect any paraphilic tendencies.

Exhibitionism — As mentioned above, one male participant reported he had been diagnosed with Exhibitionism Disorder. Overall, 20 men (25%) and seven women (64%) reported they have exposed their sexual parts. Ten men (50%) and five women (71%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “enjoyed it somewhat.” Seven men and one woman reported “it was O.K.,” and three men and one woman reported they “did not like it.” This seems to be a high number for both men and women. Again, it is possible that some of the participants exposed their sexual parts under circumstances that had nothing to do with having a paraphilic tendency, thus their answers may not be a reflection of exhibitionism.

Voyeurism — The same man who was diagnosed with Exhibitionism reported he was also diagnosed with Voyeurism Disorder. Overall, a surprisingly high number of men (61=76%) and women (9=82%) reported they have seen other people doing sexual things. This question was supposed to screen for voyeurism, but it seems that the way the question was worded misled the participants to respond to whether they ever saw another person do something sexual. Therefore, although 36 men (59%) and seven women (78%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” these data do not really mean anything.

Transsexualism — two men reported they like to fantasize about being a woman. One of them related he is a trans-gender (he had taken estrogen and had been passing as a woman, but had not gone through the male-to-female operation). Transsexualism is not considered a paraphilia but a gender disorder. Still, it is listed in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-IV, APA, 1994) and therefore I mention it here.

Sexual Attitudes and Philosophy (Questions 32-34 and 207)

The majority of men (73=89%) and women (10=91%) reported they perceived themselves as being more liberal regarding sexual issues than most people. The majority of men (61=74%) and women (7=64%) also perceived themselves as being more liberal about religion than most people. And about half of the men (42=52%) and women (6=55%) reported they perceived themselves as being more liberal about politics than most people.

The following table represents the participants’ responses/views about politics, religion, and sex, as they compare with most people:

	No. of Men Responding	No. of Women Responding	More Liberal	The Same as Others	More Conservative
Politics	81	11	42=52% 6=55%	17=21% 2=18%	22=27% 3=27%
Religion	82	11	61=74% 7=64%	10=12% 3=27%	11=13% 1= 9%
Sex	82	11	73=89% 10=91%	6= 7% 1= 9%	3= 4% 0

Unexpectedly, 11 men (13%) and one woman reported believing they were more conservative about religion than most people. More surprising are the data that three men reported thinking they were more conservative than most people in sexual matters. These three men still practiced bestiality at the time of the study.

Next, the participants were asked to describe their sexual philosophy. Their answers were divided into six categories: (1) those who value “consent and hedonism” — “Ethical Hedonism!” Sex should be consensual

and pleasurable,” (2) those who have a “hedonistic” point of view about sex — “if it feels good, do it,” (3) those who value “consensual” sexual relationships — “consent is the key,” (4) those who value “love” as a prerequisite in a sexual relationship — “sex is an act of love,” (5) those who value “consent and love” — “it must be consensual... and it should only happen if I love the person(s),” and (6) “other” — those who gave a response which did not fall under any of these categories:

Sexual Philosophy	Men (78)	Women (11)
“Ethical Hedonism”	39=50%	9=82%
“Hedonism”	8=10%	1= 9%
“Consent”	7= 9%	
“Love”	6= 8%	
“Consent and Love”	4= 5%	1= 9%
“Other”	14=18%	

The following are examples for responses which are listed under the “Other” category:

- “Confused with an open mind.”
- “No sex unless married, then sex, sex, and sex.”
- “The only unnatural sex act is one that cannot be performed!”
- “The reason for sex is procreation.”
- “I don’t think I have one.” And —
- “Having sex with a mare.”

Participants who fit the categories of hedonism were considered by me to be more liberal since they tend to perceive sex as a hedonistic (fun) activity. Therefore, in this question (207), the majority of men (47=60%) and women (10=91%) appeared to be liberal about sex. Obviously, this does not necessarily preclude other participants who wrote responses which fit any of the other categories, as can be seen previously where the majority of men (73=89%) and women (10=91%) reported they perceived themselves as being more liberal about sex than most people.

Other ways of exhibiting liberal attitudes about sex may be through having “many” sexual partners and/or engaging in “daring” sexual behaviors such as group sex. The men in this sample reported they had an average of 61.20 heterosexual sex partners, with a range of zero to 3500. Nine men reported they did not have heterosexual sexual relations. The women reported they had an average of 48.20 heterosexual partners, with a range of three to 200. Sixty-three men (77%) and eight women (73%) reported they had homosexual sexual contact (this number probably includes abuse incidents as well). The men reported an average of 8.20 homosexual sex partners, with a range of zero to 100. Eighteen men reported they had no homosexual sexual relations. The women reported they had an average of 8.27 homosexual sex partners, with a range of zero to 45. Three women had no homosexual sexual relations.

Twenty-two men (27%) and five women (45%) reported they participated in group sex. Of them, 13 men (39%) and four women (80%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while three men reported they “did not like it.”

Although it appears that the participants in the study are open-minded and have liberal attitudes about sex, without comparing these data with a non-zoo population, there is no telling whether the participants’ responses are of any significance. Nevertheless, the majority of participants (73 men=89% and 10 women=91%) reported they perceive themselves as having more liberal attitudes about sex than most people.

CHAPTER 12

PARTICIPANTS' SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH ANIMALS

Why did the Participants Begin to Have Sex with Animals? (Questions 220 and 275-297)

The participants were asked, in an open-ended question, what made them get into sex with animals — a question everyone is curious about. Eighty-one men and all the women responded to this question, and most everyone provided several reasons for what made them initially have sex with animals. Therefore, the categories in which their answers were categorized are not mutually exclusive.

I expected participants to list curiosity and experimentation, and indeed 24 men (30%) and three women (27%) listed curiosity and experimentation as motivating factors for their initial sexual encounter with an animal. For example, one man wrote: “(I) wanted to see if the dog’s penis worked like mine and if he would feel good with orgasm. Found it very erotic and exciting.”

Fifteen men (19%) and one woman listed sexual attraction to the animal as the motivating factor for their first sexual encounter with that animal. One man described: “I was always attracted to the voluptuous, smooth and black-shimmering genitals of horses (male and female). I longed to touch them. I also loved the smell of horses.” Another four men (5%) and four women (36%) related that sex with animals “was the natural thing to do.”

Eleven men (14%) and one woman reported that “lack of social interaction” led them to have sex with animals. For example, one man described: “I did not have the self-confidence necessary to pursue human females nor the social skills to recognize when they were attracted to me.” Another man explained that as a boy: “I only had a dog for a friend. I wanted to please him so I gave him a blow-job” (I wonder how this boy came up with an idea like that?) One other man described the following: “My mother’s belief that boys were bad and that all they wanted to do is to get into girls pants (made me get into sex with animals). I was always ashamed that I was a boy... So I stayed away from girls and got animals as companions.”

Nine men (11%) and one woman reported that one of the factors in their first sexual encounter with an animal was hearing about or seeing people having sex with animals. One man read the Kinsey study. Another explained that: “watching my older brothers and their friends (10 to 15 year old) have sex with farm animals, and watching neighbor boy of 10-12 have sex with my dog” led him to have sex with animals. This description makes it seem like bestiality was very popular in the area where this participant grew up.

Eight men (10%) and one woman related that seeing animals mate or acting in a sexual manner triggered their first sexual encounter with them. The woman described: “Watching animals when they were either aroused or mating aroused me, so I wanted to touch, and that led to other things.” One man described the following: “I think a strong motivation for me to try sex with our dog was due to watching him hump his sleeping cushion. He was un-neutered and when he became sexually active he would scrunch his sleeping cushion up and masturbate against it.” Another man (1%) related that “reading dog anatomy books on the male dog’s penis” led him to have sex with animals. Overall, it is interesting to note that throughout the questionnaire, 17 men (21%) and two women (18%) commented (without being asked about it) on the fact that they found viewing mating animals sexually arousing.

Seven men (9%) and two women reported they began having sex with animals because the animals were available. For example, one man (who no longer had sex with animals at the time of the study) described the following: “The opportunity for me to try sex with animals existed, I tried it, it felt good, so I kept doing it three to five times per week that summer. I never told anyone until now. I felt guilt the first couple of times. The guilt quickly passed. I enjoyed the sexual contact but it was not some thing that I felt a need to do.” One man related that he started having sex with animals because “(I was) getting sick of trying to screw my sister, so I turned to doing pigs.” Another man described the following: “I had loved horses very much for many years --

their smell, feel, strength, their sensuality. Soon after I got my first horse, my shipmates jokingly asked if I was having sex with him. I thought ‘why not?’ That’s how the idea was planted.”

Eight men (10%) reported that bad experiences with people lead them to have sex with animals. One man wrote, for example: “Animals do not hide their emotions, motivations, or desires; they are inherently truthful. They give as they get... Humans are incapable of this; utterly.”

Seven men (9%) admitted they were “extremely horny!!” as one of the men put it, or as another man wrote: “Initially, it was a hormone raging adolescent teen experiment.”

Five men (6%) and three women (27%) reported the dog was the one who initiated their first sexual encounter. One man described: “When I was at the age of three, our dog liked to lick me all over, and it was the best feeling I ever knew. He licked my genitals too, it was very stimulating. Even to look at a wet dog’s tongue aroused me.” Another man explained: “As this large dog humped my leg, I felt I could direct this sexual expenditure toward a mutually pleasant episode.”

Four men (5%) and two women (18%) reported their fantasies about having sex with animals led them to act out their fantasies. One man wrote: “I began masturbating while I was in the fourth grade... masturbating several times a night and sometimes in the morning... having fantasies of heterosexual, homosexual, and zoophilic content... I came up with my sexual fantasies with absolutely no prior knowledge of sexual acts other than having on a few occasions watched dogs copulating.”

Three women (27%) described that they had a “supportive partner” who influenced/helped them with their first sexual experience with an animal. One woman explained: “I was in a non-exclusive primarily S/M relationship with a bisexual man, and I was exclusively the bottom. It was an ongoing fantasy of ours to have me be sexual with a dog.”

Two men and one woman reported the fact that it was forbidden excited them. The woman explained: “Having sex with animals felt right, but it also gave me a ‘naughty’ thrill I liked.” Another man reported he began having sex with animals because “it was a unique experience that no one I knew had tried.”

Two men related that they started having sex with animals to avoid possible detrimental sexual relations with humans. One man related that as an adolescent: “My sexual drive grew stronger over the next couple of years and my sadistic fantasies more violent and cruel. At about age 13 I tortured a frog. I was appalled and profoundly ashamed of myself for this and vowed never to do such again... I turned into myself and looked within as deeply as I could and thought about morality and goodness and evil with all the effort and ability and understanding that a 13- year-old child could master. And I found that my passion for animals, to love them at once emotionally and sexually was strong enough to satisfy the imperatives of my sexual drive and thus subdue my sadistic impulses; that I could build my actualized sexuality around love and caring and tenderness if I turned to animals. And that I did. I am still today proud of that child for finding the road, which for him, led away from the abyss that then seemed so close. By 15 I had become a sexually active zoophile... and all past sadistic fantasies were completely removed from conscious access.” Another man described a different situation: “Compulsion — as I was dealing with being anally raped by my father I found myself acting out with cats.”

Two men related that they identify with the animals —

— “I identify strongly with horses; want to be a horse and want to experience things that horses experience including sex with other horses.” And —

— “I truly believe in reincarnation, and I think based on experiences, and behavior, that I was a member of the canine family in my past life. Why? Well, sometimes, when the mood strikes, I feel a relationship with dogs, and I feel a common language among myself and any dogs around me. It’s very hard to explain, but I feel a draw to dogs. Rottweiler above all other breeds. It’s as if I am a Rottweiler, but I have the body of a human. My soul is in touch with them, but my body doesn’t look like them.”

One man related that he began having sex with animals because he “liked the feeling of giving control to an animal.” Another man reported it was peer pressure that made him have sex with animals, and one man said he did not know what made him start having sex with animals.

The following table summarizes the various (non-exclusive) answers given by the men for the question “What made you get into sex with animals?”:

<u>“What made you get into sex with animals?”</u>	Men (81)
Curiosity	24=30%
Sexual attraction to the animal	15=19%
Lack of social interaction	11=14%
Hearing about or seeing others do it	9=11%
Seeing animals acting in a sexual manner	8=10%
Bad experiences with people	8=10%
The animals were available	7= 9%
Being horny	7= 9%
The dog initiated	5= 6%
“It was the natural thing to do”	4= 5%
Having fantasies about sex with animals	4= 5%
The fact that it was forbidden	2= 2%
Identification with the animals	2
Wanting to avoid possible detrimental experiences with humans	2
Wanting to try something no one had	1= 1%
Reading about the dog penis’ anatomy	1
Acting out own sexual abuse	1
Wanting to give a sense of control to the animal	1
Peer pressure	1
Did not know	1

The following table summarizes the various (non-exclusive) answers given by the women for the question “What made you get into sex with animals?”:

<u>“What made you get into sex with animals?”</u>	Women (11)
“It was the natural thing to do”	4=36%
Curiosity	3=27%
The dog initiated	3
Having a “supportive partner”	3
The animals were available	2=18%
Having fantasies about sex with animals	2
Sexual attraction to the animal	1= 9%
Lack of social interaction	1
Hearing about or seeing others do it	1
Seeing animals acting in a sexual manner	1
The fact that it was forbidden	1

Later (in questions 277-297), the participants were given specific statements, and they were asked to rate how true was each statement with regard to the reason they first had sex with an animal or how much did it contribute to their first sexual encounter with an animal. Again, I expected “curiosity” to be the main reason, and indeed this was “reason number one” for the women (7=70%), shared with “sexual attraction,” and “reason number two” for the men (55=67%).

I did not expect to find the “number one reason” for both men (62=76%) and women (7=70%) to be “sexual attraction to the animal.” “Reason number three” for the men (49=60%) and “number two” for the women (6=67%) was that they “wanted to express love or affection to the animal.” The next reason listed by 41 men (51%) was “having fantasies about sex with animals” and the women listed “sexual fantasies” as “reason number five” (4=36%). These findings suggest that the majority of participants are sexually oriented toward animals.

The following table represents the men’s answers to questions 277-297, describing their reasons for their first sexual encounter with an animal:

Reason for the First Sexual Encounter With an Animal	Number of Men Responding	Completely and Mostly True	Somewhat True	Not True
I was sexually attracted to the animal	82	62=76%	12	8= 10%
I was curious	82	55=67%	20	7= 9%
I wanted to express love or affection to the animal	82	49=60%	15	18=22%
I had fantasies about sex with animals	81	41=51%	16	24=30%
I wanted to relieve sexual tension	81	39=48%	26	16=20%
I felt I could only trust animals	80	34=43%	22	24=30%
I wanted to experience something else	81	31=38%	21	29=36%
The animal wanted it	80	26=33%	27	27=34%
I had no human partners available	79	24=30%	26	29=37%
I was lonely	81	22=27%	26	33=41%
I was too shy to have sex with humans	80	17=21%	26	37=46%
I identified with the animal of my gender	80	17=21%	17	46=58%
I heard that others have done it	80	14=18%	15	51=64%
I saw it in pornography/erotica	80	10=13%	10	60=75%
I read erotic/pornographic novels about sex with animals	80	7= 9%	10	63=79%
I was not allowed to associate with boys/girls	80	1= 1%	13	66=83%
If I did to a human being what I did to the animal, I would have gotten arrested	78	3= 4%	2	73=94%
I watched videos/films about sex with animals	80	3= 4%	0	77=96%
I saw live sex shows with animals	78	2= 3%	2	74=95%
I was forced into it	80	2= 3%	1	77=96%
I saw discussions and/or pictures about sex with animals through computer services	80	1= 1%	2	77=96%

The following table represents the women's answers to questions 277-297, describing their reasons for their first sexual encounter with an animal:

Reason for the First Sexual Encounter With an Animal	Number of Women Responding	Completely and Mostly True	Somewhat True	Not True
I was sexually attracted to the animal	10	7=70%	2	1=10%
I was curious	10	7=70%	2	1=10%
I wanted to express love or affection to the animal	9	6=67%	2	1=11%
The animal wanted it	10	6=60%	1	3=30%
I wanted to experience something else	11	6=55%	2	3=27%
I had fantasies about sex with animals	11	4=36%	3	4=36%
I felt I could only trust animals	10	2=20%	2	6=60%
I heard that others have done it	10	2=20%	1	7=70%
I saw it in pornography/erotica	11	2=18%	1	8=73%
I read erotic/pornographic novels about sex with animals	11	2=18%	1	8=73%
I wanted to relieve sexual tension	10	1=10%	6	3=30%
I was lonely	10	1=10%	3	6=60%
I watched videos/films about sex with animals	11	1= 9%	2	8=73%
I had no human partners available	10	0	3	7=70%

Continued

Reason for the First Sexual Encounter With an Animal	Number of Women Responding	Completely and Mostly True	Somewhat True	Not True
I was too shy to have sex with humans	10	0	3	7= 70%
I saw live sex shows with animals	10	1=10%	0	9= 90%
I saw discussions and/or pictures about sex with animals through computer services	10	1=10%	0	9= 90%
I identified with the animal of my gender	10	0	1	9= 90%
I was not allowed to associate with boys/girls	10	0	0	10=100%
I was forced into it	10	0	0	10=100%
If I did to a human being what I did to the animal, I would have gotten arrested	10	0	0	10=100%

The First Sexual Experience with an Animal (Questions 208-210 and 221-227)

The men had their first sexual encounter with an animal at an average age of 13.16, and the women at an average age of 19.55. The following table represents the participants’ responses to the question “How old were you the first time you had sexual contact with an animal?”

	Average Age	SD	Minimum Age	Maximum Age	Median	Mode
Men (82)	13.16	3.70	3	25	13	14 (13)
Women (11)	19.55	13.68	8	47	13	13 (2)

Contrary to the popular belief about the farm boy who “uses” farm animals for his sexual experimentations, the majority of men (52=63%) and all 11 women reported their first animal sexual experience was with a dog. Eight women (73%) had sex with a male dog, two with a female dog, and one is unknown since one woman did not specify. The following table depicts the 82 men’s descriptions about the type of animal with which they had their first animal sexual experience:

Type of Animal	No. of Men who had Sex With It
Dog	52=63% (17=21% with a female dog, 35=43% with a male dog)
Horse	14=17% (10=12% with a mare, 4=5% with a stallion)
Cow	6= 7%
Cat	3= 4%
Fowl	3= 4%
Sheep	2= 2%
Donkey	1= 1%
Pig	1= 1%

Of the 81 men who responded to the question about the animal’s gender, 41 men (51%) had sex with a female animal, and 40 men (49%) had sex with a male animal during their first sexual encounter with an animal.

Next, the participants were asked about the type of relationship they had with the animal with which they first had sex. Thirty-one men (38%) and five women (45%) reported the animal they had sex with for the first time did not belong to them but to someone they knew: a sister, a friend, a boyfriend, the neighbors, their father, grand-parents, or it was a friend of the family pet. Included in this category, one man reported he “worked in a veterinary hospital,” and another man explained: “It was a pony I was leasing at a local stable.” One woman “house sat for his owners,” and another woman described: “A partner and I made contact through an ad and built a relationship with a man and his shepherd.” Only 28 men (35%) and four women (36%) had

sex with their own pet. The following table depicts the participants' answers about their relationships with their first animal sex partner:

Type of Relationship	Men (81)	Women (11)
Belonged to someone they knew	31=38%	5=45%
Their own pet	28=35%	4=36%
A farm animal (not necessarily theirs)	15=19%	
A stray animal	5= 6%	2=18%
A guide dog (this man is legally blind)	1= 1%	
"It was a guy's dog. I was forced to give oral sex."	1= 1%	

Then the participants were asked where their first sexual encounter with an animal took place. Six men did not specify where their first animal sexual encounter took place other than stating "farm" (four men), and "friend's" and "neighbor's." Of the 72 men who provided coherent answers, 32 men (44%) first engaged in sex with an animal outside: in a pasture, countryside, yard, field, garden, neighbor's yard, riding arena, race track, woods, or in a forest. Twenty one men (29%) performed their first animal sexual encounter in a home environment, such as a bedroom, living room, etc.. Three of them did it in someone else's home, and one man had his first sexual experience with an animal in a hotel room. Nineteen men (26%) had their first animal sexual experience neither at home nor outside; they had sex with the animals in a barn, a breeding house, garage, shed, stable, paddock, chicken house, kennel, and one man who used to work in a veterinarian clinic had sex at "the Vet, after hours." Eight women (80%) engaged in their first animal sexual encounter in a home environment, four of whom did it in someone else's home. One woman did it in the family barn, and another woman, who was home-sitting at the time had her first animal sexual experience at the "dog's home, by the pool." The following table summarizes the participants' responses to the question "Where did your first sexual contact with an animal take place?"

Place of First Sexual Experience With an Animal	Men (72)	Women (10)
Outside	32=44%	1=10%
Home environment	21=29%	8=80%
Neither (barn etc.)	19=26%	1=10%

It was somewhat difficult to categorize the participants' descriptions of what occurred during their first sexual encounter with an animal, since not all of them provided details, and some engaged in several behaviors at the same time. Five men provided responses which were too ambiguous to be categorized anywhere, such as: "I stuffed kittens down my pants." Of the other 77 men, 23 (30%) reported they masturbated the animal, including one man who described his behavior as: "Heavy petting' and the dog started humping my hand."

Eighteen men (23%) engaged in intercourse with the animal. For example, one man related the following: "I stood on a bucket so I could reach her vulva. Unzipped my pants and proceeded to insert penis. Thrusted back and forth until I ejaculated."

Ten men (13%) had the animal perform anal sex on them. One man described: "(I) was walking home from (the neighbor's) farm, taking a short cut thru the fields. His dogs followed. When out of sight of people, I took off my clothes, got down on my knees, and stroked his penis. Didn't take much of that, then he walked behind me and mounted me."

Seven men (9%) had oral sex performed by the animal on them. For example: "I was masturbating using a porn magazine and the dog began to lick, so I let him continue until orgasm."

Three men (4%) engaged in mutual oral sex with an animal. One man described the following: "My first sexual experience was with a white haired dog (around age 13). We had mutual fellatio. He took me in his mouth, wrapped his tongue around my penis and then chewed hungrily on his tongue. Since then I have seen other dogs do this to themselves and so it is not too astounding. When I began sucking him he stopped working me and pressed his muzzle against my groin and fucked my mouth with great enthusiasm. For nearly a year we got together several times a month for such sexual activities."

Three men performed oral sex on the animal: “I had wanted to try it for very long, and here I was with a cow who I knew well. I used my hands and my mouth to satisfy her vagina and anus.” And: “A boy forced me to suck off a dog.”

Three men masturbated the animal and the animal performed oral sex on them: “I masturbated the dog to orgasm. In gratitude, he started vigorously licking my anus and genitals.”

Another three men masturbated the animal and masturbated themselves by rubbing their genitals on the animal. For example: “I approached her in the paddock (she was loose). I petted her and began to massage her genitals. I then masturbated her and rubbed myself against her leg.” Two men (3%) only masturbated themselves by rubbing their genitals on an animal.

Three men performed anal sex on an animal: “Very late at night, I went into the stable when my horse was lying down, and had anal sex with him.”

One man had the animal perform oral and anal sex on him, and another man only “held, caressed, (and) kissed her (the animal).”

Overall, 30 men (39%) masturbated the animal, 18 (23%) had intercourse with it, 14 (18%) had the animal perform oral sex on them, 11 (14%) had the animal perform anal sex on them, seven (9%) performed oral sex on the animal, and three men (4%) performed anal sex on the animal.

Among the women, three (30%) reported they masturbated the animal. One case was somewhat different: “The male hound used to hump people’s legs a lot. Mom and dad always made him stop and told us to stop him. But I’d encourage him if nobody else was around. I liked the funny, naughty feeling it gave me, especially when he squirted that stuff all over my bare leg.”

Three other women had the dog perform oral sex on them. For example: “I was on my bed, horny and masturbating. My dog was on the bed with me. At first I had not thought of doing anything with her, but then she started to lick my leg, and the thought came to me that I wondered what would happen if I moved so that she could lick my vulva and clitoris. So I moved so she could reach there and she did lick them.”

Four women (40%) had intercourse with a dog the first time they had a sexual encounter with an animal. One of them had intercourse and oral sex performed by the animal, and another had intercourse after she performed fellatio on the dog. One woman had intercourse and mutual oral sex: “We kissed, licked each other, and then I got on the floor and encouraged him to mount me. I lost my virginity that day” (at age 13).

The following table summarizes the participants’ descriptions of the sexual activities they engaged in the first time they had a sexual encounter with an animal:

Type of Sexual Behavior	Men (77)	Women (10)
Masturbation of the animal, only	23=30%	3=30%
Intercourse, only	18=23%	1=10%
Intercourse & oral sex performed by the animal		1
Intercourse & oral sex performed by the woman		1
Intercourse & mutual oral sex		1
Anal sex performed by the animal, only	10=13%	
Oral sex performed by the animal, only	7= 9%	3=30%
Mutual oral sex	3= 4%	
Masturbation of the animal & oral sex performed by the animal	3	
Masturbation of the animal & self-masturbation by rubbing the genitals on the animal	3	
Anal sex performed by the men, only	3	
Oral sex performed by the men, only	3	
Self-masturbation by rubbing the genitals on the animal	2= 3%	
Masturbation of the animal & oral sex performed by the man	1= 1%	
Oral sex performed by the animal & anal sex performed by the animal	1	
“Held, caressed, (and) kissed her (the animal)”	1	

The participants were then asked how they felt after their first sexual encounter with an animal. More than half of the men (43=58%) and half of the women (5=50%) who responded to this question perceived their first sexual encounter with an animal as a “positive” one. For example: “Wonderful. I thought about it for weeks. I fell in love with him.” And: “After I had done it, I couldn’t believe how good it felt. No woman feels like a mare.”

Twenty-two men (30%) and four women (40%) perceived the experience as “positive with a mix of negative.” For example: “I enjoyed it but that was lost in guilt and a need to hide the experience.” One man related that although he enjoyed the feeling, he was frustrated because the animal “was too small.”

Nine men (12%) and one woman (10%) perceived their first sexual encounter with an animal as a “negative” experience. One man experienced “extreme pain,” and another related: “I was extremely disgusted at what I’d done, and tried not to think about it.” The woman who perceived her experience as negative explained: “it was not something a ‘normal’ person would do; ashamed and dirty.” One man, in this category, reported he was frustrated since he tried several times with no success.

The following table summarizes the participants’ descriptions of their feelings about their first sexual encounter with an animal:

Type of Feeling	Men (74)	Women (10)
Positive	43=58%	5=50%
Positive with a mix of Negative	22=30%	4=40%
Negative	9=12%	1=10%

Next, the participants were asked what they thought the animal felt about that first sexual encounter. The majority of the men (51=69%) and women (8=73%) who responded to this question, believed the animal had a “positive” sexual encounter with them. For example —

— “I think he enjoyed it because he didn’t growl or bite or try to get away.”

— “He liked it — he pressed in and humped against my hand.”

— “She liked it. Would raise tail for me...”

— “I think she enjoyed it because she would position herself for optimum penetration on her own volition.” And —

— “Since she initiated it, wagged her tail, and continued to initiate, I thought it was something she enjoyed and wanted to do.”

Ten men (14%) and one woman (9%) believed the animal “did not mind” the sexual encounter. For example —

— “She barely shifted from one foot to the other. She certainly didn’t stop chewing her cud.”

— “He didn’t seem to mind, as he remained lying down and relaxed.” And —

— “He didn’t mind it. He stood still, raised his tail and his penis remained hard” (other participants might have perceived the animal’s erection as a “positive” reaction).

Seven men (9%) and two women (18%) reported they simply “did not know” what the animal felt. For example —

— “Hard to tell what a chicken thinks. Not an especially complex animal.”

— “Who cares what a cow thinks. I don’t think a cow has a thought process!!” And —

— “The dog clearly had been trained and rewarded (with a steak) to perform.”

Only six men (8%) and none of the women believed the sexual encounter was a “negative” experience for the animal. For example —

— “At first she didn’t like it because she kept shifting her hind quarters left or right. I surmise because she was not in heat.”

— “Afraid because it didn’t know what I was doing. Un-threatened though, because it didn’t try to flee.” And —

— “Upset. She was in estrus but struggling to get away.”

The following table summarizes the participants’ responses to the question “What do you think the animal felt?”

Type of Feeling (animal)	Men (74)	Women (11)
Positive	51=69%	8=73%
Did not mind it	10=14%	1= 9%
Don’t know	7= 9%	2=18%
Negative	6= 8%	0

Number and Specie of Animal Sex Partners (Questions 211-212 and 243-260)

The participants were asked to count the different animals with which they had sexual relations. Of the 80 men who responded to this question, one man had only one animal as a sex partner, while another man reported 3,892 animals as sex partners. The median was 19 animals, and the mode was 11. Five men had 11 animals as sex partners. Excluding the man who reported 3,892 animals, the average number of animal sex partners the men reported to have had was 71.27, with a standard deviation of 162.39, and a range of one to 900 animal sex partners.

The average number of animal sex partners the women reported to have had was 9.55, with a standard deviation of 10.35, and a range of two to 35 animal sex partners. The median was six, and the mode was two. Three women reported they had two animals as sex partners.

The following table depicts the various species of animals and the number of animals from each species with which the 82 men had sex throughout their lives:

Animal	No. of Men who had Sex With that Animal	Mean	SD	Range	Median	Mode (No. of Men)
Male Canines	74=90% (2 didn’t report No. of canines)	21.72	62.98	1- 400	5	3 (13)
Female Canines	59=72% (1 didn’t report No. of canines)	15.03	71.98	1- 7	3	2 (14)
Male Equines	44=54% (2 didn’t report No. of equines)	41.81	159.35	1- 1000	3	1 (11)
Female Equines	43=52% (2 didn’t report No. of equines)	65.83	191.65	1- 1000	3	1 (9)
Female Bovines	33=40% (2 didn’t report No. of bovines)	21.90	89.29	1- 500	2	1 (13)
Female Sheep	17=21% (1 didn’t report No. of sheep)	70.44	248.24	1- 1000	3	1 (4)

Continued

Animal	No. of Men who had Sex With that Animal	Mean	SD	Range	Median	Mode (No. of Men)
Female Felines	16=20%	1.81	1.60	1- 7	1	1 (10)
Male Bovines	15=18%	10.36	17.49	1- 50	2	1 (4)
	(1 didn't report No. of bovines)					
Male Felines	14=17%	1.86	1.41	1- 5	1	1 (8)
Female Swine	13=16%	10.42	17.14	1- 60	3	1 (4)
	(1 didn't report No. of swine)					
Female Goats	11=13%	9.10	16.13	1- 50	2	2 (4)
	(1 didn't report No. of goats)					
Male Swine	8=10%	7.63	17.15	1- 50	1	1 (5)
Male Goats	8=10%	5.50	6.97	1- 20	2	1 (4)
Female Fowls	8=10%	3.50	3.07	1- 10	3	1 (3)
Male Sheep	7= 9%	8.00	8.77	1- 20	2	2 (2)
Male Fowls	2= 2%	1.50		1- 2		

The following table is a continuation of the above. It depicts “other animals” that were mentioned by the men as sex partners. However, it should be taken into consideration, that some of these animals fit the above categories, thus may have already been mentioned by others who knew in which category they belong:

Animal	No. of Men who had Sex With that Animal	Mean	Range	Mode (No. of Men)
Female Llama/Camel	5= 6%	4.60	1-14	1 (3)
Female Donkey/Burro (equine)	3= 4%	3.00	1- 6	
Male Deer	3= 4%	2.67	1- 6	1 (2)
Female Tapir	3= 4%	1.33	1- 2	1 (2)
Female Deer	2= 2%	20.00	12-28	
Male Llama/Camel	2= 2%	3.00	2- 4	
Male Tapir	2= 2%	1.00		1 (2)

In addition —

— One man reported that he had sexual contact with 12 different female antelope, and with two male antelope.

— One man reported that he had sex with a female eland.

— One man reported that he had sexual contact with two female buffaloes and with one male buffalo (bovine).

— One man reported that he had sex with five female rabbits.

— One man reported that he had sex with a male rhesus macaque.

— One man reported that he had sexual contact with a female wolf and a male wolf (canine).

— One man reported that he had sex with a male rhinoceros (I actually talked to that man. He told me he used to work in a zoo, and once he performed oral sex on a male rhinoceros when no one was around). And —

— One man reported that he had sexual contact with five male lions, four female lions, 40 male tigers, and eight female tigers (feline).

Overall, the men seem to have enjoyed sexual relations with a variety of species, some of which are difficult to imagine as sex partners (i.e. lions, tigers, wolves, rhinoceros, etc.). Some of the men in this study

seem to have also enjoyed sexual relations with a high number of animals. It is also interesting to note the “popularity” of the animals as sex partners: (1) male canines, (2) female canines, (3) male equines, (4) female equines, (5) female bovines, (6) female sheep, (7) female felines, (8) male bovines, (9) male felines, (10) female swine, (11) female goats, (12) male swine, (13) male goats, (14) female fowls, (15) male sheep, and (16) male fowls.

The women in the current study seem to be much less “adventurous” than the men. The following table depicts the various species of animals and the number of animals from each species with which the 11 women have had sex throughout their lives:

Animal	No. of Women Who had Sex With that Animal	Mean	SD	Range	Median	Mode (No. of Women)
Male Canines	11=100%	6.91	9.30	1- 30	4	2 (4)
Female Canines	8= 73%	1.50	0.76	1- 3	1	1 (5)
Male Equines	6= 55%	1.50	0.55	1- 2		1 (3), 2 (3)
Male Felines	3= 27%	1.00				1 (3)

In addition —

- One woman reported that she had sex with two different female felines.
- One woman reported that she had sexual contact with a female equine.
- One woman reported that she had sex with a male bovine. And —
- One woman reported that she had sexual contact with a male rabbit.

In summary, the most popular animal sex partner the men (74=90%) and the women (11=100%) reported was a male canine. Second in line for the men (59=72%) and for the women (8=73%) was a female canine. Thirdly, the men (44=54%) and the women (6=55) reported about male equines. Then patterns changed, and the men reported about female equines (43=52%) as their next most popular animal sex partner, while the women reported about male felines (3=27%).

During the year before the study, the men reported an average of 6.95 different animal sex partners, with a range of zero to 100, and the women reported an average of 1.73, with a range of zero to five (these numbers include 14 men and two women who did not have sex with animals in the year before the study). The following table depicts the participants’ responses about the number of animal sex partners they had during the year before the study:

	Average No.	SD	Range	Median	Mode
Men (81)	6.95	16.42	0 (14) — 100	2	2 (19)
Women (11)	1.73	1.56	0 (2) — 5	1	1 (4)

How Often do the Participants Have Sex with Animals? (Questions 213-216)

Fourteen men (17%) reported they did not have sexual relations with animals at the time of the study. Of these 14 men, five indicated they did not have sex with animals in the past year only because of situations beyond their control — not because they did not want to have sex with animals. One man explained, for example: “Currently, I don’t have an animal sexual partner, because my life is in too much chaos for me to be seriously involved with anyone, man, woman, or canine.” This left nine men (11%) in this sample who completely stopped having sex with animals. Four of them explained that for them sex with animals was merely something they did during adolescence, and one man reported that sex with animals was a way of acting out for him, and that now he is “cured.”

Two women reported they did not have sexual relations with animals at the time of the study. One woman explained that sex with animals, for her, was part of S/M activities with an ex-sex-partner. The other

woman related that she did not have sex with animals during the past year because her children are living with her. She elaborated that in the past, she was caught having sex with an animal, and this information was used by the authorities to try to take her children away from her.

The following table depicts the participants' responses about their frequency of animal sex during the year before the study took place:

	Average Frequency	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mode
Men (68)	2.96 per week	4.29	Once a week	3 times a day	1.33 per week	Once a day (7)
Women (9)	1.80 per week	2.14	Once a month	Once a day	Once a week	2.5 a week (2)

What do the Participants Sexually Do with Animals? (Questions 228-242)

It turned out that in the current study, only 45 men (55%) “always” or “primarily” had vaginal-penile intercourse with female animals, while 31 men (38%) “rarely” or “never” did so. I found it further surprising that 31 men reported they “always” or “primarily” took the time to masturbate the female animal, and 27 men (34%) “always” or “primarily” even performed oral sex on them. The following table represents the men’s various sexual behaviors with female animals:

Sexual Behaviors with Female Animals	No. of Men Responding	Always and/or Primarily	Sometimes	Rarely and/or Never
Vaginal-Penile Intercourse	82	45=55%	6	31=38%
Masturbation of the animal	81	31=38%	21	29=36%
Cunnilingus	80	27=34%	14	39=49%
Rubbing Genitals on the animal	81	16=20%	19	46=57%
Fellatio	81	11=14%	21	49=60%
Anal Intercourse	79	4= 5%	6	69=87%

Several men described their fellatio experiences, performed by the animals —

— “I have one mare that will wrap her mouth around my penis.”

— “Having my cat eat her food off my penis almost every morning.” And —

— “My pony nuzzles my genitals when I ‘scritch’ her. I usually do this as foreplay, but sometimes let her nuzzle me to a climax. She will also perform anallingus on me when I paint myself with molasses” (this man, however, reported that no female animal has ever performed fellatio on him).

Twenty-four men described additional “other” sexual behaviors that they have engaged in with female animals. For example —

— Five men reported that they french-kissed female animals.

— Three men sucked on “teats” of female animals.

— Two men engaged in urophilic activities: “Urination by me under her tail and urination by her on my stomach and genitals.”

— “Nasal intercourse” (with a mare).

— “Massaging anus.”

— Group sex with a cow and pony mare.

— “Put my whole arm in a mare’s vagina. She got very juicy and backed into me. I think she enjoyed it very much. I arm-fucked her for about five minutes.”

- Digital sex.
- “Using a vibrating back massager.” And —
- “I have raped female pups. I have slit open the bellies and used the hole for a place to fuck.”

The most common sexual behavior the men in this study engaged in with male animals was masturbation of the animal, followed by performing oral sex on the animal. Fifty-two men (64%) “always” or “primarily” masturbated the male animal, and 33 men (42%) “always” or “primarily” performed oral sex on the male animal as part of their sexual encounters. The third most popular sexual behavior the men reported was anal intercourse performed by the animal on them. Twenty-seven men (34%) reported they “always” or “primarily” engaged in this behavior when they had sex with a male animal. The following table represents the men’s various sexual behaviors with male animals:

Sexual Behaviors with Male Animals	No. of Men Responding	Always and/or Primarily	Sometimes	Rarely and/or Never
Masturbation of the animal	81	52=64%	16	13=16%
Fellatio performed by the men	78	33=42%	23	22=28%
Anal Inter. performed by animal	79	27=34%	14	38=48%
Fellatio performed by animal	79	18=23%	19	42=53%
Rubbing Genitals on the animal	80	12=15%	15	53=66%
Anal Inter. Performed by men	79	6= 8%	7	66=84%

Eighteen men described additional “other” sexual behavior they have engaged in with male animals —

- Three men reported french-kissing.
- Three reported anallingus performed by the animals.
- Three men reported “docking” — using the animal’s penile sheath as a vagina, also known as penile-sheath intercourse.
- “Golden showers.”
- “Fisting bulls to orgasm. Some like it a lot. If you don’t believe it ask someone who works with cattle and knows something of the history of collection techniques.”
- “Held the male’s penis around the base of the shaft while it copulated with a female, so I could feel/see the intromission/thrusting and the ejaculation take place.”
- “Male dogs do not like to fool around with male humans. I have tricked them: dressed as a female with female clothes, and been raped by dogs.” And —
- The same man who reported raping and torturing female puppies, reported the same behaviors toward male puppies (more about him later).

There were no major surprises in the women’s reports about their sexual behaviors with female animals (questions 228-233). Four women (36%) reported they “always” or “primarily” had the animal perform oral sex on them, and one woman (10%) reported she “primarily” rubs her genitals on the animal. No other sexual behavior was reported by the women as being done on an “always” and/or “primarily” basis. One woman described another sexual behavior: “My mare likes her udder rubbed/scratched.” The following table represents the women’s various sexual behaviors with female animals:

Sexual Behaviors with Female Animals	No. of Women Responding	Always and/or Primarily	Sometimes	Rarely and/or Never
Cunnilingus performed by animal	11	4=36%	2	5=45%
Rubbing Genitals on the animal	10	1=10%	1	8=80%
Masturbation of the animal	10	0	3	7=70%
Cunnilingus performed by women	10	0	1	9=90%

In questions 235-241 which asked about the women’s various sexual behaviors with male animals, I was surprised to find out that, again, like the men, the most common sexual behavior engaged in by the women was masturbation of the male animal. Seven women (64%) reported they “always” or “primarily” engaged in this behavior. Contrary to the popular theme in porn movies, only six women (55%) reported they “always” or “primarily” engaged in vaginal-penile intercourse with a male animal, while two women (18%) reported they “never” did. Five women (45%) “always” or “primarily” took the time to perform oral sex on a male animal as part of their sexual encounters, and one woman reported she “always” has anal intercourse (performed by the animal) when she has sex with a male animal. The following table represents the women’s various sexual behaviors with male animals:

Sexual Behaviors with Male Animals	No. of Women Responding	Always and/ or Primarily	Sometimes	Rarely and/ or Never
Masturbation of the animal	11	7=64%	4	0
Cunnilingus	11	6=55%	4	1= 9%
Vaginal-Penile Intercourse	11	6=55%	3	2=18%
Fellatio	11	5=45%	3	3=27%
Anal Intercourse	10	1=10%	0	9=90%
Rubbing Genitals on the animal	10	0	4	6=60%

One woman related: “I once tried to have him (a male dog) mount me, but I was afraid of getting caught, so did not go thru with it.”

Why do the Participants Currently Have Sex with Animals? (Questions 301-314)

As was reported earlier, 14 men (17%) disclosed that they had not had sexual relations with animals during the year before the study was conducted. Of them, a maximum of nine men completely stopped having sex with animals. Two women reported they have not had sex with animals in the past year. One used to do it as part of S/M games with an ex-human lover, and the other was too scared of being caught since her children lived with her and she did not want to lose them.

In questions 301-314, the participants were given various statements for which they were asked to rate how true was each statement with regard to the reason they were still having sex with animals. The most common answer to the question “why do the participants currently have sex with animals?” was “because I am sexually attracted to the animal.” Sixty-two men (91%) and all nine women (100%) reported this reason was “completely true” or “mostly true” for them. Only three men (4%) reported they were not sexually attracted to animals. The “number two reason,” for both men and women, was “because I want to express love or affection to the animal.” Fifty men (74%) and six women (67%) reported this reason was “completely true” or “mostly true” for them. Only six men (9%) and one woman (11%) reported this was “not true” for them. Again, these findings suggest that the majority of participants in the current study have a sexual orientation toward animals.

The following table depicts the men’s answers to the question “I am currently having sex with animals because —”

The Reasons	No. of Men Responding	Completely and/ or Mostly True	Sometimes True	Not True
I am sexually attracted to the animal	68	62=91%	3	3= 4%
I want to express love or affection to the animal	68	50=74%	12	6= 9%
The animal(s) is/are accepting and easy to please	67	45=67%	14	8=12%
The animal(s) want(s) it	68	45=66%	14	9=13%
I want to relieve sexual tension	68	27=40%	24	17=25%
I feel I can only trust animals	67	26=39%	15	26=39%
I want to experience something different	67	17=25%	15	35=52%
I identify with the animal of my gender	67	16=24%	14	37=55%

Continued

The Reasons	No. of Men Responding	Completely and/or Mostly True	Sometimes True	Not True
I see it in pornography/erotica	68	14=21%	15	39=57%
I am lonely	67	10=15%	19	38=57%
I have no human partners available	67	8=12%	13	46=69%
I am too shy to have sex with humans	67	5= 7%	11	51=76%
If I did to a human being what I do to animals, I would be arrested	66	2= 3%	1	63=95%
I am being forced into it	67	0	1	66=99%

(A few men noted that it is not true that animals are easy to please, especially when it comes to horses).

As you can see, one man reported the sentence “I am currently having sex with animals because if I did to a human being what I do to animals, I would be arrested” is “completely true” for him. This man, Participant BX=76, is a 63 year old male-to-female transsexual. In subsequent questions he explained that he “tricks” male dogs into thinking he is a female, and they, in turn, rape him. (Participant AI=35 who reported raping and killing animals, reported this sentence is “mostly true” for him).

The following table depicts the nine women’s answers to the question “I am currently having sex with animals because—”

The Reasons	Completely and/or Mostly True	Sometimes True	Not True
I am sexually attracted to the animal	9=100%	0	0
I want to express love or affection to the animal	6= 67%	2	1=11%
The animal(s) want(s) it	6= 67%	2	1=11%
The animal(s) is/are accepting and easy to please	5= 56%	2	2=22%
I want to relieve sexual tension	1= 11%	5	3=33%
I feel I can only trust animals	1= 11%	2	6=67%
I want to experience something different	0	5	4=44%
I am lonely	0	4	5=56%
I see it in pornography/erotica	0	3	6=67%
I have no human partners available	0	1	8=89%
I am too shy to have sex with humans	0	1	8=89%
I identify with the animal of my gender	0	1	8=89%

Using Pornography (Questions 204-206, 220, 291, 294-297, and 312)

Seventy-nine men (98%) reported they had used pornography/erotica. Fifty one of them (65%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while only four men (5%) reported they “did not like it.” Seventy-four men (91%) reported they had used “bestiality-related pornography.” Fifty-nine of them (80%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while four (5%), again, “did not like it,” although surprisingly, they were still engaging in bestiality at the time of the study. One man, who in subsequent questions related that his bestiality is ego-dystonic, reported he “hated it.” Nineteen men (25%) reported they watched a live animal sex show. Seventeen of them (89%) “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” while two reported “it was O.K.”

Ten women (91%) reported they had used pornography/erotica. Eight of them (80%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” and the other two related “it was O.K.” Nine women (82%) reported they had used “bestiality-related pornography.” Eight of them (89%) “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it.” The ninth woman reported “it was O.K.” Only one woman reported she watched a live animal sex show. She “enjoyed it very much.”

The majority of men, reported it was “not true” that they started having sex with animals because they “saw it in pornography/erotica” (60=75%), “read erotic/pornographic novels about sex with animals” (63=79%), “saw live sex shows with animals” (74=95%), “watched videos/films about sex with animals” (77=96%), nor “saw discussions and/or pictures about sex with animals through computer services” (77=96%).

The majority of women, too, reported it was “not true” that they started having sex with animals because they “saw it in pornography/erotica” (8=73%), “read erotic/pornographic novels about sex with animals” (8=73%), “watched videos/films about sex with animals” (8=73%), “saw live sex shows with animals” (9=90%), nor “saw discussions and/or pictures about sex with animals through computer services” (9=90%).

These findings correspond with Dewaraja and Money’s (1986) suggestion that pornography does not cause paraphilia (in this case zoophilia). The correct sequence, they state, is that developmentally, the paraphilia comes first. Paraphilic pornography is able to stimulate sexually only those who already have the same type of paraphilic imagery built into their lovemap (Money, 1986). Ellison (1970), however, argues that bestiality depicted in pornography is not produced and marketed to secret bestialists, but rather to “countless thousands of us who are otherwise sexually normal, as it were, (who) are utterly fascinated by the depiction” (Ellison, 1970, p. 215).

The following table represents the men’s answers to questions 291 and 294-297, which describe their reasons for their first sexual encounter with an animal as they relate to pornography:

	Number of Men Responding	Completely and/or Mostly True	Somewhat True	Not True
I saw it in pornography/erotica	80	10=13%	10	60=75%
I read erotic/pornographic novels about sex with animals	80	7= 9%	10	63=79%
I watched videos/films about sex with animals	80	3= 4%	0	77=96%
I saw live sex shows with animals	78	2= 3%	2	74=95%
I saw discussions and/or pictures about sex with animals through computer services	80	1= 1%	2	77=96%

The following table represents the women’s answers to questions 291 and 294-297, which describe their reasons for their first sexual encounter with an animal as they relate to pornography:

	Number of Women Responding	Completely and/or Mostly True	Somewhat True	Not True
I saw it in pornography/erotica	11	2=18%	1	8=73%
I read erotic/pornographic novels about sex with animals	11	2=18%	1	8=73%
I watched videos/films about sex with animals	11	1= 9%	2	8=73%
I saw live sex shows with animals	10	1=10%	0	9=90%
I saw discussions and/or pictures about sex with animals through computer services	10	1=10%	0	9=90%

Among the open-ended answers to question 220 which asked “What made you get into sex with animals?,” one man related that “reading dog anatomy books on the male dog’s penis” led him to have sex with animals. Another man read the Kinsey study. Eight men (10%) and one woman related that seeing animals mate triggered their first sexual encounter with them. The woman described: “Watching animals when they were either aroused or mating aroused me, so I wanted to touch, and that led to other things.” Overall, throughout the questionnaire, 17 men and two women commented (without being asked about it) that they find viewing animals mating sexually arousing.

Only 14 men (21%) reported it was “completely true” or “mostly true” that they were having sex with animals at the time of the study because they saw “it in pornography/erotica,” while 39 men (57%) reported this was “not true” for them. None of the women reported that it was “mostly true” or “completely true” that she engaged in sex with animals because she saw “it in pornography/erotica.” Three women (33%) reported it was “somewhat true” that they were having sex with animals at the time of the study because they saw “it in pornography/erotica,” while six women (67%) reported this was “not true” for them.

On Being Forced to Have Sex with Animals (Questions 288, 298-299 and 309)

As mentioned before, one man reported the statement “I began having sex with animals because I was forced into it” was “completely true” for him. Another man reported it was “mostly true,” and another man said this statement was “somewhat true” for him. Only one man reported that the statement “I am currently having sex with animals because I am being forced into it” was “somewhat true” for him. None of the women reported she began having sex with animals or she was having sex with animals at the time of the study because she was forced to do so.

Question 298 specifically asked if the participants were ever forced into having sex with animals. Three men (4%) and none of the women reported they were forced to have sex with animals. Participant AI=35 related: “A boy down the street forced me to give oral sex to a male dog at age seven.” Participant BX=76 reported he was bullied into it: “I was told to get down and take my turn at sucking the dog’s cock, or go home never to come back.” Two other men (one of them reported he was never forced to have sex with animals) related that a dog forced itself on them.

To which Animals are the Participants Most Attracted? (Questions 261-269)

Four men did not respond to the question “To what animals are you most attracted?” One of them related: “I’m not sure I was really attracted to animals. I saw and heard other farm boys talk about it. I tried it. It was more like masturbation than being attracted to an animal. A convenience!” He explained that he had sex with animals only “For about four months during summer when I was 14. During same time I had fantasies and wet dreams about a neighbor woman, age 20 who wore brief shorts and halters...” Another man related that he “Was never attracted to animals, sexually or psychologically/emotionally.” He also said: “My dog is available, but I would not consider myself attracted to him.” The third man stated: “I did it copying the older boys. It was sex play. It was fun. Have not done it since early childhood.” And the fourth man simply stated: “I was never attracted to animals.” Obviously these four men are not zoos.

The other 78 men and all 11 women admitted to being attracted to certain animals. I was surprised, however, to see that most participants listed several species as their object of attraction rather than one specie. It is also interesting to note the “popularity” of the animals as objects of attraction as reported by the men: (1) canines (68 men = 87%, reported they were attracted to dogs), (2) equines (63 men = 81%, reported they were attracted to equines), (3) bovines, (4) goats, (5) sheep, (6) felines, (7) swine, and (8) fowls. The women reported a slightly different “popularity” list: (1) canines (all 11 women = 100%, reported they were attracted to dogs), (2) equines (eight women = 73%, reported they were attracted to equines), (3) felines, (4) bovines, and (5) goats.

The following table depicts the 78 men’s responses about which animals they found attractive, from the most attractive animal to the least, and points out whether these men reported preferring male, female, or both genders of the animal they find attractive (questions 261-268):

Animals they find Attractive	No. of Men (78) Attracted to this Animal	No. of Men Attracted to Female Animals	No. of Men Attracted to Male Animals	No. of Men Attracted to Both Genders
Canines	68=87%	13=19%	27=40%	28=41%
Equines	63=81%	11=17%	14=22%	38=60%
Bovines	25=32%	13=52%	3=12%	9=36%

Continued

Animals they find Attractive	No. of Men (78) Attracted to this Animal	No. of Men Attracted to Female Animals	No. of Men Attracted to Male Animals	No. of Men Attracted to Both Genders
Goats	22=28%	16= 73%	3=14%	3=14%
Sheep	21=27%	16= 76%	3=14%	2=10%
Felines	12=15%	9= 75%	1= 8%	2=17%
Swine	11=14%	5= 45%	3=27%	3=27%
Fowls	3= 4%	3=100%	0	0

Thirty men (38%) provided further comments, in question 269, about “other” animals they found attractive. Again, some of these species belong to the above categories. Thus, it is possible that others find these animals attractive as well, but they had already listed them above:

- Female dolphin/porpoise — 6 men
- Female deer — 5 men
- Female llamas — 4 men
- Both genders of deer — 3 men
- Large female cats (cheetah, cougar, lion, tiger, or panther — felines) — 3 men
- Male wolves (canines) — 2 men
- Both genders of wolves (canines) — 2 men
- Both genders of donkeys (equines) — 2 men
- Both genders of large cats (felines) — 2 men
- Both genders of dolphin — 2 men
- Male bears — 2 men
- Both genders of kangaroos — 2 men
- Nearly all hooved animals of both genders — 2 men
- Both genders of sea lions — 1 man
- Male deer — 1 man
- Both genders of llamas — 1 man
- Female camels — 1 man
- Both genders of camels — 1 man
- Female zebras (equines) — 1 man
- Large male cats (felines) — 1 man
- Female bears — 1 man
- Both genders of bears — 1 man
- Male rhinoceros — 1 man
- Both genders of antelope — 1 man
- Female rabbits — 1 man
- Both genders of apes/monkeys — 1 man
- “Most fur bearing” female mammals — 1 man, and —
- “Any male animal. I don’t care for female animals” — 1 man (this participant rated himself as a “1” on the Kinsey scale — more on that later).

All 11 women responded to questions 261-268. The following table depicts their responses about which animals they find attractive, from the most attractive to the least, and points out whether they reported preferring male, female, or both genders of the animal they find attractive:

Animals they find Attractive	No. of Women (11) Attracted to this Animal	No. of Women Attracted to Female Animals	No. of Women Attracted to Male Animals	No. of Women Attracted to Both Genders
Canines	11=100%	0	10= 91%	1= 9%
Equines	8= 73%	1= 11%	7= 88%	0
Felines	3= 27%	1= 33%	0	2=67%

Continued

Animals they find Attractive	No. of Women (11) Attracted to this Animal	No. of Women Attracted to Female Animals	No. of Women Attracted to Male Animals	No. of Women Attracted to Both Genders
Bovines	1= 9%	1=100%	0	0
Goats	1= 9%	0	1=100%	0

Homosexual Relations with Animals (Questions 166, 223, and 228-269)

The participants reported having clear preferences between female and male animals, while some reported they were attracted to both genders (questions 243-260). In some cases, a preference for same sex animals seemed to be more common. For example, out of 68 men (87%) who reported attraction to dogs, 27 (40%) were attracted to male dogs, compared with 13 (19%) who reported they were attracted to female dogs. Out of 63 men (81%) who reported attraction to equines, 14 (22%) were attracted to male equines, compared with 11 (17%) who reported they were attracted to female equines. Out of three women (27%) who reported attraction to felines, one was attracted to female felines, while the two other women reported they were attracted to both genders of felines. The one woman who reported attraction to bovines was attracted to female bovines.

Also, as mentioned earlier, 40 men (49%) and two women (20%) reported their first animal sexual experience was with an animal of their gender (question 223). It was further evident from the participants' descriptions of their sexual behaviors with animals (questions 228-242) that they did engage in sexual relations with animals of their gender.

The following table compares the number of male and female animals from various species with which the 82 men reported having had sex throughout their lives:

	No. of Men who had Sex With that Animal	Average No. of Animals	SD	Range	Median	Mode (No. of Men)
Male Canines	74=90% (2 didn't report No. of canines)	21.72	62.98	1-400	5	3 (13)
Female Canines	59=72% (1 didn't report No. of canines)	15.03	71.98	1-7	3	2 (14)
Male Equines	44=54% (2 didn't report No. of equines)	41.81	159.35	1-1000	3	1 (11)
Female Equines	43=52% (2 didn't report No. of equines)	65.83	191.65	1-1000	3	1 (9)
Male Bovines	15=18% (1 didn't report No. of bovines)	10.36	17.49	1-50	2	1 (4)
Female Bovines	33=40% (2 didn't report No. of bovines)	21.90	89.29	1-500	2	1 (13)
Male Felines	14=17%	1.86	1.41	1-5	1	1 (8)
Female Felines	16=20%	1.81	1.60	1-7	1	1 (10)
Male Sheep	7= 9%	8.00	8.77	1-20	2	2 (2)
Female Sheep	17=21% (1 didn't report No. of sheep)	70.44	248.24	1-1000	3	1 (4)
Male Swine	8=10%	7.63	17.15	1-50	1	1 (5)
Female Swine	13=16% (1 didn't report No. of swine)	10.42	17.14	1-60	3	1 (4)

Continued

	No. of Men who had Sex With that Animal	Average No. of Animals	SD	Range	Median	Mode (No. of Men)
Male Goats	8=10%	5.50	6.97	1-20	2	1 (4)
Female Goats	11=13% (1 didn't report No. of goats)	9.10	16.13	1-50	2	2 (4)
Male Fowls	2= 2%	1.50		1-2		
Female Fowls	8=10%	3.50	3.07	1-10	3	1 (3)

“Other male animals” that were mentioned by the men as sex partners (question 259) are as follows (it should be taken into consideration, that some of these animals fit the above categories, thus may have already been mentioned by others who knew in which category they belong) —

- Deer — 3 men
- Llama/Camel — 2 men
- Tapir — 2 men
- Antelope — 1 man
- Buffalo (bovine) — 1 man
- Rhesus macaque — 1 man
- Rhinoceros — 1 man
- Wolf (canine) — 1 man
- Lions and male tigers (feline) — 1 man

The following table compares the number of male and female animals from various species with which the 11 women reported having had sex throughout their lives (questions 243-258):

	No. of Women who had Sex With that Animal	Average No. of Animals	SD	Range	Median	Mode (No. of Women)
Female Canines	8= 73%	1.50	0.76	1-3	1	1 (5)
Male Canines	11=100%	6.91	9.30	1-30	4	2 (4)
Female Equines	1= 9%	1.00				
Male Equines	6= 55%	1.50	0.55	1-2		1 (3), 2 (3)
Female Felines	1= 9%	2.00				
Male Felines	3= 27%	1.00				1 (3)

These findings are particularly interesting in light of the fact that the majority of men (57=72%) and women (8=73%) rated themselves as heterosexually inclined (between 0 and 2) on the Kinsey scale when it came to their relationships with humans. As mentioned before, one man in this study, who rated himself as a “1” on the Kinsey scale, related that he was attracted to “Any male animal.” He went on to state: “I don’t care for female animals.” This is an interesting phenomenon which is worthy of further investigation.

Being Caught (Questions 270-272, and 348-349)

Twenty-seven men (33%) and two women (18%) reported they had been caught having sex with an animal (question 270). The men were caught 1.63 times on average (question 271), with a standard deviation of 0.88, and a range of once to four times. Sixteen men reported they had been caught once. Of the two women, one was caught once and the other reported she was caught twice having sex with an animal.

The following are the two women’s painful descriptions of what happened when they had been caught (question 272) —

— “(I) was caught by my (then) current human lover. He shot the dog, and beat me up, cracking a rib and breaking my nose. I, obviously, left him as soon as I could.” And —

— “I was revealed by someone to authorities and it was used to try and take my children away. My children found my picture of it (in the newspaper (?)). They were young enough not to really understand...” Although this woman was not arrested for having sex with animals, she further describes: “I have been prosecuted in court and the information was used to try and take my children away, even though it was a private thing I had not done in the home.”

Twenty men provided information about the consequences of being caught (question 272). The following table summarizes the participants’ responses:

<u>Consequence of Being Caught</u>	<u>Men (20)</u>	<u>Women (2)</u>
Nothing essentially happened; nothing was said about it	5=25%	
Other	5=25%	
Bad experiences (2 of the men were arrested)	4=20%	2=100%
The other person became interested in what they were doing and/or became sexually aroused	4=20%	
Both no reaction and bad experiences at different times	2=10%	

Overall, only six men and the two women encountered negative experiences upon being caught. Given the negative reactions society at large has about bestiality, I find this remarkable.

The following are examples for the “Nothing essentially happened; nothing was said about it” category:

— “My grandfather walked in on me, he just turned his head and walked away.” And —

— “My aunt was looking out the window and saw me masturbating a neighbor’s dog. She never said anything about it.”

The following are examples for the “Other” category —

— “I was caught twice in two days, back to back with two different dogs. I was 14 years old. I ran away from home, got caught the ... through the juvenile justice system ... therapy. It was all very positive in the end.”

— “It was in my childhood. My mother tried to keep me away from sexual experiences with our dog, but she failed. I only became more careful.”

— “Dad walked into the barn while I was having intercourse with a mare. He made a statement and walked out. The statement was ‘if this is a regular thing, you need help.’ The incident was never mentioned again. I was in my 20s.” And —

— “I was 16 at the time. I left the doors to my side of the house and room open so I could hear my parents, but I didn’t hear them. My dad walked in while I was rubbing myself against the dog. He walked out and I stopped. Later that night, he confronted me about it. He reminded me about the legality of it and I passed it off as masturbation. He recommended his videos and my hand with some lubrication. Later, I applied the idea of lubrication to dogs, which made it possible for us to have full intercourse.”

Also in this category, another man provided a lengthy description (too long to be quoted here) about a man who caught him while penetrating a mare. They then sat down and discussed zoophilia for two hours. The man asked the participant if he had sex with horses because he couldn’t get a human date, and the participant assured him that was not generally a problem for him, and explained that he is, in fact, attracted to horses. A few months later, the man gave the participant an Arab stallion...

The following are examples for the men’s “Bad experiences” category —

— “...I was attacked by the boys who saw me and rumors were spread... it was one of the worst times in my life.”

— “I was ridiculed and ostracized by my peers — my life changed.”

— “Hunters saw me with a horse in the woods. I was arrested and charged with lewdness. (The charge (was) dropped when I agreed to see a psychiatrist.” And —

— “In 1989 (in a) Younkers (sic) NY farm show, late (at) night (I paid \$)300.00 for one hour time with a sheep... Before I was done, (the) owner turned me in to cops. Two police officers beat me up and killed the sheep. (They) arrested me, 30 days time served and fined.”

The following are examples for the “The other person became interested in what they were doing and/or became sexually aroused” category —

— “My wife, before we were married, had left my house. She returned unexpectedly and found me in the barn trying to penetrate a miniature mare’s vagina... she wanted me to continue. She had sex with me when the mare refused.”

— “It was the boy I had my first homosexual experience with — (I) was rubbing myself against his male dog. He did not participate, but did masturbate to us.” And —

— “My aunt and her daughter caught me with their dog. They were not concerned since they were also having sex with animals. I had seen them before and think that’s how I really got started into this life style. They teased me at the time about telling mom and dad, but they didn’t. They then joined in. My cousin was my first female encounter, then my aunt that same day. After that we saw each other regularly. The two of them introduced me to horses, swine and other animals.”

The following are examples for the “Both no reaction and bad experiences at different times” category:

— “(The) first time, I was caught by a friend... I lost him as a friend... The second time... nothing came of it... The guy who caught me never confronted me.” And —

— “... three times people just left, and one time (was caught) by police and was let go when dog ran off and (they) could not prove it happened without the dog.”

Question 348 asked the participants if they had ever been arrested for having sexual relations with an animal. As described above, two men were arrested, and only one of them ended up being punished for the act (served 30 days in jail and fined). Another man, although he was not caught in the act, describes the following (in question 349) —

— “My computer has been seized because they (in Germany) think I have spread my animal pornographic material. Having is not forbidden, giving it to others is forbidden and can be sentenced with prison, money paying and loss of the whole computer equipment.”

Other People who Know (Questions 319-322, and 341-342)

Only 22 men (27%) and five women (45%) reported that no one in their everyday life knew they had sex with animals (question 319). In other words, 60 men (73%) and six women (55%) reported that there were people in their everyday life who knew they had sex with animals. I expected bestiality/zoophilia to be more of a secret than the study revealed. Even more remarkable, four men and one woman told their mothers (question 321)!

Question 320 asked the participants to count the people who knew. The following table depicts their responses:

	Average No. of People	SD	Range	Median	Mode
Men (57)	8.12	15.12	1-100	4	2 (12)
Women (5)	4.40	3.36	1-10	4	4 (2)

(Another man responded with “lots” instead of providing the number of people who knew about his bestiality. Upon inquires, he elaborated that he lives in a small town where almost everyone knows about his animal sex).

Question 321 asked the participants about the types of relationships they had with the people in their everyday life who knew they have had sex with animals. Since most participants reported having more than one person knowing about their animal sex, the 58 men and six women who responded to this question, provided a variety of answers. Therefore, the number of the various responses exceeds the number of respondents. The following table represents the 58 men and the six women’s responses to question 321:

Type of Relationship	Men (58)	Women (6)
Friends	27=47%	4=67%
Spouses	14=24%	1=17%
Other relatives (including a father, a daughter and a son)	9=16%	1=17%
Co-workers	9=16%	
Siblings	8=14%	
Roommates	7=12%	
Girlfriends/boyfriend (fiancé)	6=10%	1=17%
Male lovers (at least 3 of them were zoos)	6=10%	2=33%
Acquaintances	6=10%	1=17%
Mothers	4= 7%	1=17%
Therapists/counselors	3= 5%	

In addition (not included in the above list), one man reported he had told his seven therapy group members. Another man related that his sex partners and swinging friends knew about his animal sex, and another man reported that four elders in his church knew about his bestiality. Two men related that they freely admit the fact that they had sex with animals, but did not provide further details. The woman whose son knew, commented that “too many” people knew in addition to her son. She further related: “My son found out through court case. Others found out also. It was strained and embarrassing.”

Question 322 asked the participants about the above people’s reactions upon finding out. Fifty-three men and six women provided cogent responses to this question. Again, reactions vary and exceed the number of responses since the participants reported different reactions by different people. In some cases, it was very difficult to understand what exactly the participants wanted to convey in their responses, and the categories overlap. The following table represents the participants’ responses:

Reaction	Men (53)	Women (6)
Acceptance/understanding	27=51%	2=33%
Not an issue/didn’t care	15=28%	1=17%
Curiosity	14=26%	1=17%
Positive reactions or becoming sexually aroused	9=17%	3=50%
Negative reactions	8=15%	1=17%
Shock/surprise	7=13%	1=17%

The following are examples for the “Acceptance/understanding” category —

— “Wife: ‘is that all? I thought you were going to say you’re gay!’”

— “They loved me before, they love me still. Lucky me! :)” And —

— “Some of them had to pause for a few moments to consider the ethics themselves and arrive at their own conclusions, but in all cases those conclusions have been the same as mine — that zoophilia is different, but not harmful or sociopathic. I have never lost a friend, or had anyone think any less of me either personally or professionally, through revealing my zoophile nature to them. If I am good enough friends with someone that we get on well, and I believe that they have enough sense to think the ethics through, then I tell them. If I get the feeling that someone will be offended by it, then I don’t press the issue. I have no reason to alienate myself from otherwise reasonable people, and no desire to upset them by forcing them to consider things

they're not emotionally and/or intellectually equipped to handle. Working for a technology company is particularly cool, since engineers really don't seem to be that bothered about the sexual orientation of their fellow engineers, and are only really concerned about whether or not you can hack the code!"

The following are examples for the "Not an issue/didn't care" category —

- "(He) shrugged it off with a 'to each his own' attitude."
- "Had known for years so was not surprised." And —
- "My roommate is a zoophile and my two other friends are zoophiles."

The following are examples for the "Curiosity" category —

- "Most are curious for more info. I usually explain it as a logical responsibility of owning an intact male (he's a show dog)."
- "Always a great deal of curiosity or morbid fascination."
- "Interested to know what it felt like." And —
- "His reaction was somewhat curious about why I would be interested in sex with animals."

The following are examples for the "Positive reactions or becoming sexually aroused" category —

- "Wow! Neat!"
- "It's one of the things that brought my fiancé (and me) together, since he's also a zoophile."
- "My wife (then girlfriend) was relieved to find out why I was keeping a distance from her as she considered it a trivial difference in our friendship." And —
- "My daughter at a young age, 15 or so, caught me and my sister-in-law with a dog and a horse. She was so turned on that she just joined in."

The following are examples for the "Negative reactions" category —

- "My mother is freaked and utterly disgusted."
- "I'm crazy, belong in a nut home. Some threaten to kill me."
- "Disgusted, angry at first. We are still family." And —
- "My wife's friend will no longer speak to me or to her because she objects so strongly to me."

The following are examples for the "Shock/surprise" category —

- "Silence, shock, and then many questions."
- "Astonished, curious, but not hostile as I feared." And —
- "My mom was shocked, but she accepts me as who I am although she does not approve of my lifestyle."

As mentioned before, 14 men (24%) reported their wives knew about their animal sex, six men told their girlfriends, and another six men revealed it to their male lovers, of whom at least three were "zoos" themselves. All together, it appears that there were at least 26 people who had been in intimate relationships with the men in the study and knew about their bestiality. Two women reported they revealed their animal sex affairs to lovers, one told her husband, and another woman told her fiancé. This means there were at least four persons who had been in intimate relationships with the women in the study and knew about their bestiality.

Question 341 asked specifically: "If you are/were married or have lived with another human being in an intimate relationship for more than a month, has/have that/these person(s) known about your animal sex?"

Of the 61 men (74%) who responded to this question (which means they had been in such an intimate relationship), 29 men (48%) reported they have not told their intimate partners about their animal sex, while 32 men (52%) did tell them. Among the eight women (83%) who responded to question 341 (which means they had been in an intimate relationship such as described in the question), three women (38%) have not told their partners about their animal sex, while five women (63%) did tell their partners.

Question 342 asked about the intimate partners' reaction upon finding out about the participants' bestiality. Several men who previously reported they did not reveal their animal sex affairs to their partners provided explanations and comments, such as —

— “I was married for five years. My wife didn't know that I was 'zoo.' I was real active with her as well as with my canine lover.”

— “My wife would freak out if she knew this... she would probably cut me off...” And —

— “If I tell them it just destroys the relationship... I'm not going to change what I like and I'm not interested in changing or seeking 'help.' I just don't share this aspect of my self.”

Thirty-one men and five women provided accounts of their significant others' reaction upon finding out they had sex with animals. Some of the participants had more than one such intimate relationship, and provided different accounts from different partners. Other participants described various reactions by the same intimate partner. Again, the categories overlap. The following table represents the participant's responses to question 342:

Reaction	Men (31)	Women (5)
Acceptance/understanding	11=35%	2=40%
Not an issue/doesn't mind	11=35%	2=40%
Positive reactions or becoming sexually aroused	8=26%	3=60%
Negative reactions	5=16%	1=20%
Curiosity	4=13%	1=20%
Shock/surprise	1= 3%	0

The following are examples for the “Acceptance/understanding” category —

— “It was for my wife now like, ‘O.K., I can live with it. I don't approve of it, but I love you and accept you.”

— “...She even leaves the house just to give me the opportunity.”

— “...They all know and respect it because they respect me.” And —

— “I told her before our first intimate contact, as I think it is a requirement of ... and politeness. She could not quite imagine what it was, but said that she could not be jealous of a mare. She likes me being not a demanding husband. I come to her only if she wants it. She likes that, and I am used to sex with her, after the first years where I had to force myself not to run away from her presence as a human being near me, and a female, what was even worse.”

(It is important to note that five men, whose partners' reactions were categorized as “Acceptance/understanding,” only told their partners about past sexual activities with animals).

The following are examples for the “Not an issue/doesn't mind” category —

— “My second husband had sex with dogs previously to our marriage, so he understood.”

— “The only people I have been with sexually... they themselves have had animal relations, so it was no big deal.” And —

— “Currently she doesn't mind, as I am unlikely to leave her for a horse, and she does not see why I should have to be hurt by giving up on relationships which are important to me, and don't affect our marriage.”

(It is important to note that eight men and two women, whose partners' reactions were categorized as "Not an issue/doesn't mind" were zoos or had sex with animals themselves).

The following are examples for the "Positive reactions or becoming sexually aroused" category —

— "I think he was relieved that the 'other' in my life wasn't another man."

— "Her reaction upon finding out: 'is that all? I thought you were going to say that you're gay!'"

— "My fiancé enjoys getting involved."

— "They were accepting, glad at my honesty and happy to include a little animal fantasy in our sex life." And —

— "I only consort with sexually free thinkers, so the reaction is almost always cool."

The following are examples for the "Negative reactions" category —

— "He broke up with me after hearing it."

— "Only in two relationships did it work out (and they tried it themselves). All the others left me."

— "At first it was no big deal. Later, it was used against me in arguments: 'you're a dog fucker and I hope you catch something and die!'" And —

— "My wife thinks it's disgusting, but she tolerates it as long as I don't bring the pony into the house when she's home (or awake)."

The following are examples for the "Curiosity" category —

— "Wanted to know what it felt like." And —

— "She wants to make sure I'm not acting purely out of lust or risking injury to myself or the animal in question."

The following is an example for the "Shock/surprise" category —

— "I 'came out' to my wife over two years ago, and told her all about my zoosexuality. She was a bit shocked at first, but was very supportive."

Allowing Other People to Have Sex with Their Animals (Questions 315-316)

Surprisingly, 49 men (64%) and four women (40%) reported they would allow other people to have sex with their animals (question 315). In other words, only 28 men (36%) and six women (60%) would not allow other people to have sex with their animals. Question 316 asked the participants to explain why they would or would not allow other people to have sex with their animals. Upon analyzing their explanations, it seemed that only 17 men (24% out of the 70 men who provided cogent responses) and one woman (out of the 10 who responded to this question) would actually allow other people to have sex with their animals. The following table summarizes the 70 men and 10 women's responses to question 316:

<u>Would or would not allow others to have sex with my animal(s)</u>	<u>Men (70)</u>	<u>Women (10)</u>
Would allow other people to have sex with my animal(s)	17=24%	1=10%
Would allow, but... (only to certain people, in certain situations, and under certain guidelines)	37=53%	5=50%
Would not allow other people to have sex with my animal(s)	16=23%	4=40%

The following are examples for the "Would allow other people to have sex with my animal(s)" category —

— "My' animals have the right to choose for themselves who/what they wish to have sex with."

— “To witness the enjoyment.” And —

— “Yes because: (1) Share with those not fortunate enough to own horses. (2) Discourage others from ‘fence hopping.’ (3) Help others to feel good about themselves. (4) My QH mare enjoys it. (5) The voyeur in me — occasionally I get to watch. (6) Always hoping to find someone who might want to stay and maybe even be a gay lover too.”

The following are examples for the “Would allow, but... (only to certain people, in certain situations, and under certain guidelines)” category —

— “My favorite dog and lover is not shared. My other dog gets neglected sexually by me, so I allow my closest friends to fulfill her needs if she is in the mood.”

— “Well, it is their life. I will not decide over my partners. If my dog wants to have sex with someone, she can have it. But I would be jealous. It is her life though, so I let her do as she wishes.”

— “Sometimes. I have allowed it with close friends. Horses are not monogamous, and seem to enjoy the sexual contact. I live on a farm with 30 horses, so there are only so many I can handle :).”

— “Yes only with the understanding that that person was a close friend, that he/she would not harm the animal in any way, that the animal in question was willing, and that he/she would not tell anyone else without permission.” And —

— “I allow my roommate to have sex with some of my animals, and he allows me to have sex with his. Fortunately, our tastes in animals do not overlap very much (he’s more of a sheep, deer and goat person), but once in awhile we like to trade off. We have made an agreement on this in that we always tell the other person when we’ve had sex with the other guy’s animal, and we will generally wait 24 hours or more before having sex with that animal again. This is for several reasons. One is to reduce the already remote chance of getting an STD, and the other is because we both think it’s kind of gross to be with an animal too soon after the other guy.”

The following are examples for the “Would not allow other people to have sex with my animal(s)” category (their reasons tend to focus on jealousy, feelings of love for the animal, respect for the animal, fear of hurting the animal, and fear of STDs) —

— “STDs as well as when I allowed it once, I didn’t like how my dog responded so well to the man. It was a jealousy thing that resulted in telling the man not to return, and then harboring jealousy/resentment towards the dog for months.”

— “Would you allow someone else to have sex with your husband/wife? My mare is my partner, nobody else’s.”

— “While animals cannot catch many human STD, I can from allowing them to be available to just anyone.”

— “Would you let me have sex with your companion? Jealousy maybe, not sure really. There is an emotional bond, and any that would ask would not recognize it. They would be a bestialist, not a zoophile.”

— “I deep down truly believe that mating with my animals isn’t sex, it’s the spiritual connection of two souls to reach a level of existence that no two humans could ever reach. I will not ‘share’ my animals because it’s not ‘just sex’!!!” And —

— “God spoke to me directly and told me that my sexual relations with animals should be kept sacred and closed. Only time God ever spoke to me. I am and was a skeptic. Scared the piss out of me. And no, I was not on drugs. Make of that what you will. I assume that it was a once in a life time hallucination. None the less I have chosen to observe the admonition.”

It is interesting to note that overall, seven men (10%) and three women (30%) seemed to regard their animals as mates. Another seven men (10%) mentioned their love and or jealous feelings for their animals.

Initiating or Forcing Others into having Sex with Animals (Questions 317-318 and 327-328)

I was glad to find out that neither the men nor the women reported they had forced another person to have sex with an animal (questions 327-238). However, 25 men (30%) and one woman (9%) reported they had initiated others into having sex with animals (question 317). The following table represents the types of relationships the participants had with the individuals they initiated (one man initiated both his female partner and their friend, thus he is listed in both categories — question 318):

<u>Type of Relationship</u>	<u>Men (25)</u>	<u>Woman (1)</u>
People they met through the Internet	10=40%	
Friends	9=36%	
Intimate partners	6=24%	1=100%
Daughter	1= 4%	

The following are examples for the “People they met through the Internet” category —

— “Several zoophiles I got to know over the net. I made absolutely sure that they are totally serious and already had experiences with other animals. When I was positive they wanted it and accept my conditions (consent, security, etc.), I introduced them to sex with equine.” And —

— “On the Internet. Is an open living zoo. I received questions and I encouraged people to try it out.”

(Another woman who did not perceive herself as having initiated others into having sex with animals, reported in subsequent questions that she had encouraged people on the Internet to try to have sex with animals).

The following are examples for the “Friends” category —

— “A co-worker, the day before his wedding.”

— “A close male friend. He was 25, I was 35. He had been interested in bestiality before I knew him, from about age 12. When we met for the first time I showed him how to have sex with sheep and goats.” And —

— “Co-worker. I freely admit my preferences, and he expressed intense interest/curiosity. I showed and, with close supervision, let him try with a mare who was patient, calm, and very well trained.”

The following are examples for the “Intimate partners” category —

— “Partner. After I did it, he got into fellating the dog” (the woman initiated a male partner).

— “Boyfriend. He was curious and wanted to experience what I was doing” (man initiated a male partner).

— “My lover. He is also primarily a zoo, and lost his virginity to my dog before we even entered into a relationship” (man initiated a male partner). And —

— “Girlfriend and (ex-)wife. Just expressed my views and they both decided to try it, both oral and intercourse” (man initiated a female partner, as did four men in this sample. Two of the men who initiated their female partners noted that their female partners did not like it).

The following is what the man who initiated his daughter described (very disturbing) —

— “Daughter. She caught me and her aunt (my sister-in-law) having sex with a dog and horse. She joined in, to my surprise. I was the one hurt and upset. That was when I found out that she, my sister-in-law, and her husband were having sex for years together. I knew that my daughter was sexually active, but I thought it was only with her age group. She was/is a well developed female for her age. At 12 she looked 18.”

Another man noted that although he never initiated anyone into having sex with animals, he would have liked to do so if the person was interested.

Paid Sex with Animals (Questions 323-326)

None of the men and only one woman reported being paid to have sex with an animal (question 325). The woman explained: "Some men have responded to ads in magazines (adult) and wanted to watch me." Another woman related that although she had never received money to have sex with animals, "I accepted an offer, years ago, which never materialized." One man reported he was offered money by people on the Internet, but had always refused. Only two men and none of the women reported they had paid to have sex with an animal (question 323). The following are their explanations —

— "In 1989 Younkers (sic) NY farm show. Late night (I paid \$) 300.00 for one hour time with a sheep... Before I was done, owner turned me in to cops. Two police officers beat me up and killed the sheep. Arrested me, 30 days time served and fined." And —

— "Met drag queen at gay parade with Dane/Rottweiler, made offer, and it was accepted."

Another man related that although he never paid to have sex with animals per se, he does rent mares for riding "...and then off out of sight." Another reported he had "considered it a number of times." Two other men related the following —

— "I tried to do a movie from a magazine article ad, to make love with a dolphin, but it was a set up. I got ripped off. I do put ads in papers looking for any one with a female dolphin. I'd do anything plus \$1,000." And —

— "...the desire (to have sex with animals) is so great. I would pay if I had to, any price, often."

Medical Procedures relating to having Sex with Animals (Questions 331-336)

Twelve men (15%) and one woman (9%) reported they needed medical care as a result of having sexual relations with an animal (question 333). The woman explained: "I got a vaginal infection after my first encounter. The second time I got a severe case of hives from the semen." Eleven men provided explanations:

— "On several occasions I have used the wrong or insufficient lubricant (use J-Lube only, and lots of it, is my advice!) when having anal intercourse with my miniature stallion. I got somewhat roughed up and was treated with cortisone suppositories. (Also) when I and my mini were younger we had oral sex at least once a day, sometimes twice a day, usually with me laying on a bale of bedding and him on top of me. His forceful and copious ejaculations were often injected into my sinuses and I developed chronic sinus infections and had to take antibiotics."

— "When the knot popped in, I almost passed out. His cock grew in length, kept bottoming out in me. The pain was terrible. I went to the hospital the next day."

— "The ring around the butt was ripped and bleeding lost about 2 pints of blood."

— "My large male dog got his knot 'tied' in my anus once. He was still somewhat swollen when he pulled out and did some minor tearing. I was sore for a few days."

— "A young stallion once panicked when he started to orgasm, and his hind hoof knocked me unconscious as he leapt away."

— "Broke a finger stumbling and falling down in a stable, several bruises due to 'heavy play' with stallions."

— "I was bitten on the finger by my donkey, and the cut became infected: treated in emergency room, took antibiotics..."

— "I've had several urinary tract infections from vaginal sex. Oddly, none from anal sex."

— "Prostate infection — maybe unrelated."

— “I had an infection in the bowels. Don’t know what it was from, but could have been from the dog.” And —

— “Never truly diagnosed as caused by animal contact, I suffered a debilitating sickness, loosely identified as an Epstein-barr (Mono) like illness, though the actual form was never identified. My suspicion is that this was from oral contact with a mare.”

Two men who reported they never needed medical care as a result of having sex with animals note the following —

— “No. Safe if one is a true ‘zoophile,’ i.e. not a bestialist!” And —

— “No. A true animal lover always cares of hygiene of both lover parties. Important for a long loving relationship.”

Two men (2%) and none of the women reported they had animals that needed medical care as a result of having sexual relations with them (question 335). In question 336, they describe the following —

— “I gave a female cat a vaginal infection trying to insert a blunt/pointed object. (Also) I once cut a dog’s penis.” And —

— “I have left many dogs injured as a result of raping them.”

This is obviously very disturbing and I wish I could have contacted these people to get more information about what exactly happened. The man who raped dogs sounds like a very sick person, and I discuss his situation later. The man who inserted a blunt, pointed object into a cat’s vagina and once cut a dog’s penis — I wonder if he performed these activities only once as a child, as part of his exploration and experimentation, or whether he performed these activities as an adult, as part of his sexual activities with the cat and the dog. From his answer, it does not sound like these injuries were the result of a sex act, unless this person was a sexual sadist.

One man was upset by the question. He pointed out that: “No. She (the female animal) comes first. Sometimes to truly love your zoo partner, is to say no.”

Only one man and none of the women reported he had a surgical procedure performed on an animal to assist in his sexual relation with it (question 331). However, in question 332, where he was asked to describe the surgical procedure, it became obvious that he did not understand the question; in fact, he had a surgical procedure performed on himself: “Penile implant to correct impotence.” In other words, none of the participants had a surgical procedure performed on an animal to assist in their sexual relations with it.

Five men remarked —

— “No, (I’m) a member of animal welfare organizations. I never would do such things!”

— “I would never do anything unless it was to save the animals’ life.”

— “I’ve never even heard of such a thing, nor can I imagine what one would do or why.”

— “No, but we had a prize breeding bull that was surgically altered for breeding purposes which also allowed easier sex with it for humans.” And —

— “No, but it sounds like a good idea.”

What does the Animal Feel about having Sex with Humans? (Questions 227 and 347)

As mentioned before (question 227), the majority of men (51=69%) and women (8=73%) perceived the animal as having a positive experience the first time they had sex with an animal. Only six men (8%) thought the animal had a negative experience. The following table represents the participants’ responses:

Type of Feeling (animal)	Men (74)	Women (11)
Positive	51=69%	8=73%
Did not mind it	10=14%	1= 9%
Don't know	7= 9%	2=18%
Negative	6= 8%	0

When the participants were asked what they thought the animals felt about having sex with them, in general (question 347), none of the participants reported thinking the animals had negative feelings about having sex with them. Many provided interesting and illuminating responses. The following table summarizes the participants' responses:

Type of Feeling (animal)	Men (79)	Women (10)
Positive	41=52%	8=80%
Every situation and animal varies	33=42%	1=10%
Does not mind it	2= 3%	1=10%
Don't know	3= 4%	

The participants seemed to define "Positive" in different ways. The following are examples for the "Positive" category —

— "My dogs are happy and healthy. They usually initiate sexual relationship. Therefore I believe my dogs enjoy sex."

— "My current mate, a male German Shepherd dog, asks for his penis to be rubbed every day. Sometimes I will wake to him standing over my head."

— "They enjoy sex, as displayed thru their reaction to sexual advances/activities, or often initiating sex advances (i.e. turning tail, rubbing, nudging, mounting when not prompted)."

— "Like a release of mutual urges being satisfied as other urges for food, water, shelter, affection. Their body language indicated they enjoy sex."

— "I think that a visible orgasm proves that the animal liked it. When a dog is coming to lick me, I think he likes it too. My dogs always want to be with me."

— "I know that she (my mare) doesn't love me emotionally and she doesn't understand the concept of sex. She looks up to me as a significant other through trust and my dedication towards her. She enjoys sex only because it feels good. She shows natural equine sexual behavior towards me when I mimic stallion behavior."

— "He's a Pavlov dog. He is well rewarded for his actions. I believe he enjoys what ever sexual gratification a dog enjoys with another dog, when I suck his cock, masturbate him, or have him fuck me in the ass." And —

— One of the women related: "I have always felt that all the animals with which I have had sexual relationships enjoyed that aspect of our relationships. Some initiated it — others have sought it after being shown 'how'... all have cuddled and shown signs of affection and satisfaction (tail wagging, loving eyes, nuzzling)."

In the "Every situation and animal varies" category, it seems that the general consensus was that animals can enjoy sexual experiences with humans. Four men (included in this category) reported that "male animals (as opposed to females) seem to be very enthusiastic participants." Examples for this category are —

— "At first very confused, unless raised into it. Once they learn what is being done they can (and have) refuse, or continue. Those that like it make their desire and pleasure very well known, embarrassingly so, sometimes."

— "The experiences I have had with animals over my life convinced me that sex can be an expression of love for some animals some times. But the needs and moods of animals are complex and varied and are not constant and cannot be generalized."

— “I’ve met dogs who had no interest in anything sexual with me — who growled or wandered off if masturbated or positioned to mount. Others appear eager — pressing into the hand, positioning themselves to provide genital access. These are signs to me that they enjoy the sensations. Gripping, nipping and thrusting in response to touches or licks or other contacts show me the animal’s interest. (Also) returning or following me following interruptions.”

— “My own lovers love it. The dogs and critters I rape don’t.”

— “I hurt a few, fortunately not seriously, mainly because of ignorance for which I feel really sorry. Still I think the vast majority enjoyed the sexual encounters with me. A few even show definite signs of sexual arousal as soon as they see me.”

— “My partner, a German Shepherd/Labrador bitch, does not want to copulate, not even with other dogs. She tells me. It is just as easy to understand a dog as a human. She loves it when I perform oral sex with her though. How do I know? She tells me. She comes back for more, she doesn’t want me to stop. I would love to copulate with her though, but it is her decision and I am not going to push her in that matter.”

— “Some enjoyed — any animal wants to please its master.”

— “In every case they eventually learn to enjoy it, some more than others, and many will actively seek me out when they crave it (in heat).” And —

— “I think the animals tend to enjoy sex very much, in general. They do have moods, and will always make me aware of them. There are times when they tolerate it, times when they will absolutely refuse it, and other times when they will go out of their way to solicit it and to every appearance look like they are having a great time. How do I know they enjoy it? Well, the first thing to look for is the stuff they — don’t — do, that they would normally do if I was inflicting something they didn’t enjoy on them like an injection or an oral dose of dewormer. They don’t lay their ears back, they don’t try to run away. They do not clamp their tail down over their buttocks, they don’t toss their heads and they don’t kick. Now for the stuff they — do — do... Two of my mares will often back up to me while I’m scratching their backs or buttocks... When the mares are in heat it is often possible to induce a quite noticeable orgasm in them... They will squat, raise their tails and lower their heads, close their eyes and grunt softly, and if I have a hand inside them I can clearly feel a series of very strong contractions... With the male ponies it’s not hard to tell that they’re enjoying themselves, given their lustful little whinnies, erect members and rather copious ejaculatory volumes. It’s generally pretty easy to tell when any male animal is enjoying himself, for that matter.”

Two men and one woman reported the animals “don’t really seem to mind,” although these participants, too, reported the animals like the attention and are very cooperative.

Three men reported they “did not know” or cared about the animals’ feelings. The following is an example of what one of them wrote —

— “Animals can not think. Who cares anyway. If I cared so much about animals, I would be a vegetarian.”

It is interesting to note that of all the participants who responded to this question (347), 21 men (27%) and three women (30%) described the importance of consent when having sexual relations with animals, even though the question was not about consent. The following are examples of what these participants said —

— “If they had disliked what was happening, they could have done a lot of damage with their teeth, claws, and hooves. I believe that animals can give ‘consent’.”

— “I’ve been having sexual contact with animals 30 years now. They give signals and reaction to yours and their desires to sex. Yes, an animal will consent to you having sex with it.”

— “If the animal doesn’t enjoy what I’m doing, then I stop. As long as they like it then I keep going. I can read their ‘body language’ well enough to know the difference. ‘A raised tail is a happy tail’ :) It’s more complex than just that, but it would take a lot of time to explain it.”

— “Anytime I inadvertently did something they didn’t like, I knew it.” And —

— “The animals with whom I have had long-term relationships enjoy the sex as much, or more than do I. Animals who object to my advances are not approached again. Those who simply submit, allowing me to have my way with them but who show no reaction to my advances are not approached again. I want active participation. When I lick her vagina and she squirms around and begins gently licking my penis, I interpret that to mean that she likes what I am doing. When my penis penetrates her vagina and she moans in the same contented way she moans when stretching out on the couch for a nice, relaxing nap and begins licking my face, I assume she is enjoying what’s happening to her. When the family and I are sitting around in the evening watching a video and she walks up, bold as brass, and begins to frantically lick my face and rub the insides of her lips against my cheek, when she then turns around, presents her rear end and moves that long tail to one side and if still ignored, sits in my lap and starts dry-humping my crotch in front of God and everybody, I assume she wants sex. When the family is gone and she paces from my side to the bedroom door and back, thrusts her muzzle between my legs and licks my crotch, then paces to the bedroom door again, I assume she wants to go to bed and not for sleeping, either. And when I begin the ritual by licking her muzzle and eyes, sliding my hand along her belly and making the vocalizations I always make when asking for sex and she rumbles deep in her chest, gives my face a perfunctory lick and pushes me away with her fore-paws, I assume she’s saying ‘not right now, dear.’ My current lover stands 32 inches high at the shoulder. When she stands on her rear legs, she’s well over six feet tall. She has a full-blown set of claws and teeth that can destroy any item that takes her fancy within minutes. She weighs around 140 lbs. I have personally seen her pull down a full-grown 180-lb human male attempting to break into our house and hold him flat on his back, sounding and looking like the very devil incarnate. Now I assume she didn’t want this scumbag in my home, and she was able to completely control the intruder. Doesn’t it make sense, then, to assume that if she didn’t want me messing around with her private parts she could and would make that fact abundantly and undeniably clear?”

Forcing Animals to have Sex (Questions 329-330, and 347)

As described above, in question 347, when the participants were asked what they thought the animals felt about having sex with humans, 21 men (27%) and three women (30%) described the importance of consent when having sexual relations with animals. Question 329 asked the participants if they ever forced an animal to have sexual relations with them. It was interesting to see that 41 men (50%) and all 11 women reported they never forced an animal to have sexual relations with them. Thirty-nine men (48%) reported they had forced animals to have sex with them, but 21 of them (54%) reported they had forced animals only in the past. Moreover, it appears that the definition of forcing an animal to have sexual relations differed for each individual. The following table depicts their answers:

Have You Ever Forced an Animal to have Sexual Relations	Men (82)	Women (11)
No	41=50%	11=100%
Yes	39=48%	
(Only in the past	21=54%)	
Indecisive	2= 2%	

Fifty-four men and one woman provided explanations to the above question. The following are examples of what participants who reported they never forced an animal to have sex with them said —

- “If force is necessary, it’s not fun.”
- “If animals don’t want to do something they’ll let you know. Force and coercion have no place in what I look for in sex.”
- “I would not force any one to have sex with me. I need a friendly, loving atmosphere to feel well and secure. Violence of any kind, coming from me would leave me deeply ashamed with a spoiled image of myself.”
- “I care too much for them and value their love and compassion.”
- “If the animal isn’t in the mood, why force them. I don’t like rape nor would I rape a human or animal.”

— “I don’t want to have a 1200 pound animal send me to a hospital. Believe it or not, they will show displeasure to you if you do something to them they disapprove of.”

— “While engaged in sexual activity with animals I’ve never held or tied an animal to prevent it from leaving my vicinity if it so desired.” And —

— “I’ve turned over sheep on to their backs, but if they struggle too much I let them go.”

As mentioned above, 39 men (48%) and none of the women reported they had forced an animal to have sexual relations with them. Twenty-one of them (54%) related that they only used force when they were young and inexperienced; they do not force animals anymore. The following are examples of what the men who said they had forced animals to have sex with them reported —

— “I once attempted to have vaginal intercourse with the female dog of my then girlfriend. The dog consented to it at first, but I was too rough and the dog jumped up and barked right in my ear. I stopped immediately.”

— “Yes, because my heifer didn’t initiate these contacts, I guess one could say I forced her into it. But she was trained by me to follow my commands. She didn’t seem to enjoy my penis in her vagina, and didn’t seem to object.”

— “I guess showing up when they’re in heat and screwing am (sic) as you please (counts as forcing).”

— “One time I forced a male (dog) to lay on his back as I sat on his penis. Eventually he began to relax and almost tied with me. That was the only time.”

— “Yes, several years ago when I first got my sheep. A couple of times when I had to trim their hooves (a necessary maintenance procedure on sheep, which involves catching and inverting the unfortunate animal and trimming their hooves with shears) I couldn’t help myself, and had sex with them whilst I had them inverted and restrained. However I never felt right about doing so (those occasions were the only ones upon which I felt ashamed after animal sex, and especially once I learned the conditions under which the sheep were sexually responsive), I ceased to exploit them in this way. I’m not proud of what I did then, but I feel that it was just a glitch on the way to my own ethical maturity. I certainly don’t do it any more.”

— “Since my large male dog enjoyed mounting and having anal sex with me, I decided to try penetrating him. He didn’t put up a fight but it was apparent that he was uncomfortable with me inside him. I didn’t try that again.”

— “I used to always tie horses for sex, although this is useless if they want no part of it. I rarely tie them anymore.”

— “I would put them in a spot so they couldn’t move.”

— “I don’t think my dog would voluntarily fuck me in the ass or lick my cock. I’d say I more or less bribe him.”

— “Training an animal such as a sheep or goat which has never had sex with a human before, sometimes involves physical restraint until you override their instinctive urges to escape from sex out of heat/season or with a partner of a different species.”

— “My first time I had oral sex with a black lab dog, he was held by two people.”

— “Most animals have to be forced.”

— “...sometimes male animals don’t want to let you have anal sex with them. Mostly having to hold on to keep them from leaving.”

— “Only with chickens could I call it force. I had to give chase. Mammals, no such instances have occurred.”

— “I have picked up give-away dogs and raped them and killed them.” And —

— “When I was young, considerably more stupid and very angry at the world, I also didn’t have the knowledge and respect for the animals I do today. I felt really bad about it afterwards... I would also like to make a distinction between the acts of coercing an animal to do something and forcing it to (do) something. In my opinion it is virtually impossible to force an animal by physical means to do something that is totally against its will without becoming the unwilling recipient of some pretty amazing violence. However, it is possible to use ones willpower to dominate the animal or to use our human trickiness to compel the animal to do something it would not ordinarily do. One example that comes to mind is the use of food items to distract the animal long enough to accomplish sex with it. It is certainly possible to do so with many animals, as their sense of greed usually takes over and they will let one do almost anything as long as they get to chew down on something nice. I personally find that practice distasteful and would much rather have the animals undivided attention. If one has to resort to trickery then the animal can’t possibly be truly enjoying the experience. For me the sexual act is far more rewarding when I know my partner is also having fun.”

The two men who were indecisive related the following —

— “I don’t know. A couple times when I was younger it felt forced and I felt really really ashamed, but the dog seemed to enjoy it all the same.” And —

— “Forced? Or restrained?”

Definitions (Questions 337-340)

I was curious to see how the participants in the study defined themselves in terms of being a “bestialist” and/or a “zoophile,” since this was such a heated topic during the two focus groups discussed earlier. The following table depicts their responses:

<u>Definition</u>	<u>Men (80)</u>	<u>Women (10)</u>
Zoophile	40=50%	6=60%
Both bestialist and zoophile	25=31%	0
Bestialist	7= 9%	2=20%
Neither	5= 6%	0
Other	3= 4%	2=20%

Question 338 asked the participants to explain why they defined themselves the way they did. From their explanations, it appeared that the participants perceived the various definitions in different ways (which made it very confusing).

The following are examples of how participants in the “Zoophile” category explained themselves —

— “I define myself as a zoophile because my relationships with animals are about love and trust; sex is merely an expression of that love. It is consensual and pleasurable for both parties, and either party can decline with appropriate body language. Even if sex were no longer possible with them, I would still love and adore them just as much.”

— “I enjoy sex with animals, but my main concern is if they enjoy it. It’s not just sex; I really care about my animal partners.”

— “I’m in-love with my animal partner.”

— “I have a deep life long commitment to my animals.”

— “Zoophile, because I care for the animal as much or even more than I would a person. In fact, I’ve married my mare in a private way. I’d do anything to keep her just like a wife. Does this sound strange?...”

— “I consider the animal always as an equivalent partner. Sexual activities are on the bare (sic) of friendship or will start a friendship. I am loving animals.”

— “I vastly prefer making love with horses to having sex with people. Also, I need to feel some love for the animal in order to really enjoy it.”

— “Because I love the animals and would never force them into sex or casually have sex with an animal. I consider the love and care for them more important than sex.”

— “Animals are people also.”

— “Zoophile, because I don’t just value the sex. I love and cherish my animal partners as I would a human partner.”

— “My relation to animals is nearly pure emotion. Eighty percent of my sexuality takes place in my head. The sexual acts derive from the given situation as a result of love...”

— “I enjoy giving the animal sexual gratification as much as I enjoy receiving sexual gratification from the animal. I do not use animals for a sexual outlet because another is not available.”

— “While I have lust for a large number of animals, it is the relationship formed with the animal that is the important part. I will do one night stands, cause that is part of animal nature, but I will never force myself upon one.”

— “I want an animal companion, preferable a canine or lupine female to have as companion as well as a lover. I want a being that I can trust and love with all my heart and soul and know I would get the same back, from a human I am not sure that is possible. I do on occasion have beastly urges when I am out and see an attractive dog, but nothing more.”

— “Bestialists just want sex. Zoophilia requires that a loving, caring, CONSENTING relationship exist. When I couple with an animal, it is for LOVE not for sexual release. I am a consenting, spiritual lover, NOT a bestialist!” And —

— “I love and care for the animals I am with. The word ‘bestialist’ has negative connotations, such as people using gerbils or raping animals. I am more of an animal lover than an animal user. I am aware, however, quite aware, that my relationships do include bestiality.”

The following are examples for how participants explained the “Both bestialist and zoophile” category:

— “Bestialist loves the sex, zoos love the animal. Therefore I’m both and neither. I love the sex and I really love to come home to him waiting for me. Most of the time we ‘cuddle’ and ‘pet.’”

— “I don’t consider myself one of these full blown zoophile types that identify themselves as animal kindred and that they have some sort of animal soul inside them that relates and responds to their furry sexual partner/mate more so than to humans. I find reading materials or postings by people with that viewpoint makes me feel that they’re silly all the way to disturbed sometimes. YET, I feel that there are some ‘rules’ I guess, and that one should have some affection and a relationship or relating to the animal partner other than they’re an animated masturbatory aid. I feel bad about one of my wife’s dogs that I had sex with. ...I feel that (the) relationship between me and the dog was that I used him as a furry vibrator and that that was wrong of me.”

— “Both bestialist and zoophile: while I do form emotional attachment with many animal sex partners, I have also just had sex with random animals without necessarily forming a bond of love or friendship with that animal.”

— “The differentiation into ‘bestialists’ and ‘zoophiles’ is nonsense! If you have a long-time ‘relationship’ with an animal you are a ‘zoophile’ — then you have a one-night-stand with another animal and you are a ‘bestialist’??”

— “...I certainly would not have sex with an animal that wasn’t willing, and I am emotionally involved with my own animals, but I would also be happy to have sex with an animal that I wasn’t emotionally involved with, provided that the animal was willing and receptive to my attentions.”

— “I have a deep love and affection for my horse. Still I enjoy pure sex without any emotional bond with other animals.”

— “I love my animals. I also love sex with them.”

— “If bestialist is someone who has sex with animals, and zoophile is someone with emotional attachments and/or sex with animals, both fit.”

— “A person who has a love of animals is a zoophile from the dictionary definition (zoos=animal+philos=love), while a person who has sexual relations with an animal is a bestialist also by definition. In my opinion a person who has sex with animals must be a bestialist, but I can see that a bestialist may not necessarily be a zoophile. In my own case I have sex with animals, so I am a bestialist, but I also have a deep love for them, so I am a zoophile...”

— “I began as a bestialist. However as I grew I really came to love my dog. I would consider other, casual animal encounters which I had to be in a gray area, not love, but lovingly done, not carnal, but certainly lust.” And —

— “Although I love animals, I know they are only animals and I don’t treat them as my intellectual equal and I don’t have a belief system that entertains the notion that an animal can ‘love’ me back. I don’t believe an animal can be a ‘significant other.’”

The following are examples for how the participants explained “Bestialist”:

— “I have sex with male dogs. That is the accepted term.”

— “I care for and like animals but I don’t depend on them for my own well being.”

— “I just enjoy it.”

— “I do not have an emotional attachment to them, just sexual” (this man, in subsequent questions said that he was psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals since age 12).

— “I never really gave it much thought.”

— “I’d never seen the word before.” And —

— One man provided a lengthy description of his love for his dog.

The following are examples for how the participants explained the “Neither bestialists nor zoophiles” category —

— “No real sexual attraction to animals. I have had sex with at least 100 men, but I am not in the slightest homosexual. I just love sex, any and all sex.”

— “I define myself as neither because I don’t like labels. I won’t be put in little stereotypic boxes... Am I a zoophile or bestialist as discussed on the net? I don’t know and frankly, I don’t give a damn.”

— “Neither. Just a matter of convenient sexual outlet for me.” And —

— “I don’t need nor care to use such words to define myself...”

Three men and two women suggested “Other” definitions to describe their sexual relations with animals. One woman defined herself as a “dog lover.” She explained: “I love my dog, on every level, and he me. I would have only the highest regard and affection for any animal I had the fortune to pleasure, no matter how fleeting the contact — more so, because of their pure natures, than with some of my human contacts.” Two of the men and the other woman defined themselves as “zoosexuals.” They explained that “Zoosexual ... is better than zoophile as a term because... the term fits better than the ‘philia,’” and “The term fits the regular terms: hetero, homo, bi.” The third man reported he was not familiar with the distinction between “bestialist” and “zoophile.”

When the participants’ answers were analyzed not subjectively by them, but according to definitions that mean that “bestialist” is anyone who has sex with animals, and “zoophile/zoosexual” is someone who is sexually and/or emotionally attracted to animals, the results were very different. The following table represents the participants’ objective responses about definitions:

Definition	Men (76)	Women (11)
Both bestialists and zoophiles/zoosexuals	59=78%	8=73%
Bestialist only	8=11%	
Other	9=12%	3=27%

As can be seen from this table, the majority of men (59=78%) and women (8=73%) in this study were both “bestialists” and “zoophiles/zoosexuals” (assuming there is no difference between the terms “zoophile” and “zoosexual,” according to the participants’ explanations). As some of the participants noted, “a person who has sexual relations with an animal is a bestialist by definition,” and “a person who has a love of animals is a zoophile, from the dictionary definition (zoos=animals+philos=love).”

Only eight men (11%) and none of the women in this sample appeared to qualify for the definition “bestialist only,” since they seemed to have had sex with animals only for the sake of sex. Nine men and three women were in the “other” category. Of them, four men and the women reported they did not understand the definitions, and the other five men in this category provided answers that were not comprehensive.

The question of perversion (is having sex with animals a perversion?) was another controversial topic in the focus groups. In this study 15 men (20% out of 75 who responded to this question) and two women (20% out of 10 who responded to this question) reported they thought having sex with animals was a perversion. When they explained their views, it turned out that of those 14 men, who provided explanations, only three actually believed it was wrong. The other 11 men and the two women explained that bestiality was a perversion because it was not the norm. Moreover, 19 men (37%) out of the 51 who thought that bestiality was not a perversion, and three women (60%) out of the five of that same category, believed that bestiality was not a perversion because for them it was a natural thing to do and/or it was like a sexual orientation.

Question 340 asked the participants to explain their views about bestiality and perversion. The following table represents the participants’ views:

Views about Bestiality and Perversion	Men (71)	Women (8)
Not a perversion	51=72%	5= 63%
(It is natural and/or it is like a sexual orientation)	19=37%	3= 60%
Is a perversion	14=20%	2= 25%
(Bestiality is not the norm)	11=79%	2=100%
(Bestiality is wrong)	3=21%	
Indecisive	6= 8%	1= 13%

The following are examples of what the 19 men and three women who reported believing that bestiality was not a perversion because for them it was a natural thing to do and/or it was like a sexual orientation described —

— “It is an orientation of the person, like homosexuality.”

— “It is something I was born with; a part of what I am...”

— “Animals are living breathing, loyal emotional creatures, often capable of great love and devotion. What could be more natural than loving such beings? Sex with inanimate plastic objects, now that’s weird.”

— “I see it as part of the range of human sexual behavior; unusual, but not necessarily un-healthy. I would see it as a perversion if it were forced or exploitive.”

— “Sexual desires are god-given. Interspecies copulation between non-humans is common. Also, same gender sexual activities is well-documented in non-humans. Since these activities are ‘natural,’ it is logically ‘natural’ for humans to have sexual relations with non-human animals.” And —

— “I do not believe that having sex with animals is any more a perversion than having sex with another person, having sex with oneself, or having sex with latex blow-up doll. Everyone is born with different tastes and different takes on what is weird, kinky or perverse. Doggie-style heterosex is probably some people’s idea of ‘living on the wild side’ (and is illegal in some states). From there it can take some pretty far-

out extremes. I think the word ‘perversion’ has some pretty negative connotations, where as ‘kink’ seems to be a little more descriptive. Everyone gets to have their own kinds... for some it’s dead people (yuk!). For some it’s pedophilia (double yuk!). And it just gets stranger from there... autoerotic asphyxiation, you name it. My own kink is that I find horses and many other animals to be sexually stimulating. I don’t spend much time worrying about why, because I don’t think there will ever be an answer to that question. Do I think I’m a sick person, in need of help for this ‘problem’ I have? Absolutely not. I find my sex life to be unique, varied and quite interesting and entertaining...”

The following are examples of what the other 32 men and two women who did not perceive bestiality to be a perversion described —

— “There are no perversions; only possibilities. Perversion exists only when there is pain and/or destruction, non-consensuality, and abdication of responsibility toward other beings.”

— “‘Perversion’ is a word with an intensely negative connotation. Though still very much a taboo, I do not think there need be anything negative, sick or disgusting about human-animal sex.”

— “If I want to have sex with an animal and the animal wants to have sex with me, there is no perversion. Deviance, yes. Perversion, no. It is only a perversion when it is exploited pornographically or depicted in terms of a sadist act of dominance, just as human-human sexual acts can be perverted in similar and additional ways.”

— “It is a way of life for people afraid of the human way of life.”

— “... I can’t call my contact perverted. It was not out of (the) ordinary when compared to my peers. I didn’t prefer it to human coitus; human females were not available. Is it perversion for others? — I certainly would not condone anyone hurting or abusing animals for their own sexual pleasure. None of my peers nor I ever hurt an animal — except the guy who did chickens. That might have been painful to the hen. She sure squawked!”

— “God put us all here. I don’t believe technology is going to save us, so maybe being closer to nature is a better choice.”

— “God spoke to me directly and told me that my sexual relations with animals should be kept sacred and closed. Note the word ‘sacred’ that came either from god or my deepest subconscious mind.”

— “... Sex with animals is no more ‘perverted’ than homosexuality or fetishism.”

— “The idea of ‘perversion’ is derived from the notion that sexual activity simply serves the purpose of reproduction. Hence, behaviors which are sexual but do not promote reproduction are viewed as ‘perversions of nature’s purpose.’ If sexual behavior is recreational, there is no ‘purpose’ to be turned from. No perversion. Societal disapproval is merely primitive reproductive instinct for appropriate mate selection, as viewed on a large scale. I view sex as recreational. I attempt to differentiate emotional, rational, and instinctual drive motivations in my actions, and to select those in-tune with my internal ethos. Social contract moral reasoning. Where zoophilia is mutually pleasurable and none are harmed — there is no wrong.”

— “What do you call perversion? In 1910 it was considered a perversion if a married couple had sex with the lights on! In 1950 homosexuality was called a perversion. ‘Perversion’ is only a definition, changeable every day.” And —

— “For my sexual practices to be a perversion they’d need something to deviate from (that standard would generally be the majority of ‘normal’ people). I don’t and never have respected ‘the majority’ as a viable authority on anything.”

The following are what the three men who reported bestiality was wrong, thus a perversion, described:

— “It’s wrong, but forgive me God, I’m weak.”

— “The reason for sex is procreation. The Bible states ‘each according to its kind.’ In other words humans having sex with animals cannot bring forth another life. Lastly the Bible condemns having relations with animals.” And —

— “Any one who would have sex with an animal is pretty desperate, as I am, and mostly sick.”

The following are examples of what the other 11 men and the two women who believed bestiality was a perversion because it was not the norm, described —

— “It is rare, until about 10 years ago I didn’t know of anyone else, only jokes and occasional news stories of animal mutilations. I am deciding ... that perversion is not necessarily wrong.”

— “A perversion is any sexual act out of the ordinary. Sex with animals definitely is unusual.”

— “The way society looks at us, if we were accepted as we are we would not be perverts.”

— “Yes, I have to consider that animal sex is a perversion as defined in the dictionary — that is ‘a sexual act considered to be abnormal or deviant.’ It is certainly not the norm, and is therefore ‘abnormal’ and ‘deviant’ in the true sense of those words. I don’t, however, agree with the pejorative associations that usually go with those words — that ‘abnormality’ or ‘deviance’ is necessarily a bad thing. So — as defined in a dictionary, yes, it’s a perversion. As actually (inaccurately) understood by many people — as something bad, to be cured or punished — no, I don’t think it is. It’s just a harmless paraphilia, iz (sic) all.” And —

— “Perversion means ‘something considered sick or strange by most people.’ I do not think it is sick, but the majority does. That, by definition, makes it a perversion.”

The following are what the indecisive participants said —

— “Only if it’s coercive.”

— “Depends on if restraint is used, and the goal of the person doing it. In general, zoophiles are not perverted. Bestialists are.”

— “I don’t like the word perversion! I believe that anyone who has sex with animals is a deeply traumatized individual who is attempting to make sense of the abuse he/she experiences as a child by acting out with the animals. Animal sex is a reaction to abuse, as is rape of any kind.”

— “No more than fellating the neighbor boy was child abuse. But since these are the labels attached to such activities, so be it. I have absolutely no problem with either designation.”

— “I haven’t really made up my mind about this question, although I discussed it a lot. It is a different way of being, definitely a difficult one. I am still not sure whether it is a real part of me or whether I should try to overcome it.”

— “It can be used perversely. I don’t know what to think of it from the point of view of my faith. This is a confused area for me.” And —

— “It’s not ‘normal’ by society’s standards, normal meaning average. But it is normal for me. For me, sex with humans is a perversion. Sex with my wife always made me feel ‘dirty.’ I never feel dirty after sex with a horse.”

How would the Participants’ Life be Different If they had a Close Intimate/Sexual Relationship with a Human Being? (Question 346)

This question was based on the common assumption that people who have sex with animals do so because they don’t have close intimate and sexual relations with a human being. In other words — “they don’t have a choice.” In this study, however, 36 men (46%) out of the 79 who responded to this question, and five women (45%) out of all 11 women who responded to this question, noted that they had close intimate/sexual relationships with human beings. Several of them had more than one such relationship, and others provided

several different predictions as to how their life would be if they had a close intimate/sexual relationship with a human being. Thus, the number of responses was larger than the number of participants. The following table summarizes the responses of the 36 men and five women who had such relationships:

Response	Men (36)	Women (5)
No different	10=28%	1=20%
Negative consequences	8=22%	1=20%
Positive consequences	3= 8%	0
I don't want to have such a relationship anymore	1= 3%	1=20%
I will have to have less sex with animals	1= 3%	0
I will have such a relationship only if that person accepts me as a zoo	1= 3%	0
No comments other than "I've done it"	12=33%	3=60%

The other 43 men and six women who responded to this question did not mention that they had close intimate/sexual relationships with human beings — this, however, does not mean they have not had such relationships. Again, several of them provided a number of different predictions as to how their life would be if they had a close intimate/sexual relationship with a human being. Thus, the number of responses is larger than the number of participants. The following table summarizes the responses of the 43 men and six women who did not mention that they have had such relationships:

Prediction	Men (43)	Women (6)
Positive consequences	9=21%	5=83%
Negative consequences	8=19%	0
I will have such a relationship only if that person accepts me as a zoo	7=16%	3=50%
No different	6=14%	0
I don't want to have such a relationship	5=12%	1=17%
I don't know	5=12%	0
I will have to have less sex with animals	4= 9%	0

As can be seen from these two tables, the participants who had not had close intimate/sexual relationships with a human being were more optimistic about the outcome of having such a relationship: 21% compared with 8% of the men, and 83% compared with 0% of the women thought such a relationship would have positive consequences for them.

The following are examples for the "Positive consequences" category:

- "Happier, I could share my thoughts/feelings with another human."
- "I'd feel more complete with a partner who complemented me intellectually."
- "I would not be alone." And —
- "Maybe it would help me to deal with my emotional problems if I can combine my emotional and sexual feelings."

The following are examples for the "Negative consequences" category:

- "More stress! More 'head games.'"
- "I'd be screwed up again."
- "At present all I come up with are negatives: more stress, less privacy, higher cost of living."
- "More complicated."
- "There would be too much conflict between my horse and a relationship with a human."

— “I’d probably be a miserable wreck. I lived with women three times. The longest was two years. I was depressed by the end of those two years.” And —

— “Been there and it has only served to severely complicate many aspects of my life and happiness.”

The following are examples for the “I will have such a relationship only if that person accepts me as a zoo” category:

— “It wouldn’t change too much because that other human would have to understand me and take me the way I am.” And —

— “It might be fun if I came across a human who also enjoyed playing with the animals — that’s about the only circumstance under which I’d form a sexual relationship with a human, and the animals would always be involved, too. ... I suppose it would be nice to find another human who also enjoyed the animals, and who wanted to share a relationship with me, and sex with the animals — I’d enjoy the human companionship, and yet still be able to enjoy my sexual activities with the animals.”

The following are examples for the “No different” category:

— “I’ve been there. No big deal.”

— “I had an intimate sexual relationship with my wife for the first eight years of our relationship and it didn’t change my life at all. A mental illness... rendered my wife virtually sexless for over a decade and by then, my preference for vaginal sex with bitches was complete. It was always better than sex with humans anyway...” And —

— “I’ve always had close human relationships. My bestiality was simply a fluke from the farm.”

The following are examples for the “I don’t want to have such a relationship” category:

— “I am not seeking to have a human relationship. I am happy as I am.”

— “I don’t want to do it. I am zoo exclusive and the very thought of having sex with a human disgusts me. Ask a homosexual if he wants to have sex with someone of the opposite gender.”

— “I’ve been there and I’m not going back!!!” And —

— “I don’t care to. I don’t enjoy the physical contact, and the intricacies of human relationships are painful and awkward compared to the simplicity, honesty, and elegance of animal relationships.”

The following are examples for responses in the “I will have to have less sex with animals” category:

— “I may not have sex with animals as much, but the desire would still be there...”

— “I probably would have to restrict my sexual contacts with animals.” And —

— “I’d never have sex with my dog if I was intimate with my wife, or another woman.”

How has having Sex with Animals Influenced the Participants’ Life-Style? (Question 345)

Seventy-nine men and all 11 women provided responses to this question. Their responses, however, tended to be short, hence did not provide enough data to appropriately categorize the information. It seems as though the participants were tired of filling out the questionnaire by the time they arrived at question 345. One participant wrote: “This needs a book, not a paragraph. So I will decline to answer.”

Moreover, as I categorized their responses, I realized that some responses may have been considered “positive” by the participants, given the opportunity to state their opinion, but may have been categorized by me as “negative,” and vice versa. Again, several participants expressed various ways in which their life-style had been changed as a result of having sex with animals. Thus, the number of responses is larger than the number of participants.

Also, since this was an open-ended question, it makes sense to assume that the participants did not report all the ways in which their life-style had been changed as a result of having sex with animals. They may not have thought about everything, they may have been tired of filling out the questionnaire, or they may have been intimidated by the magnitude of the question. This is especially apparent in the category of “Leading a life of secrecy” where only 22 men and one woman mentioned the need to be secretive and to lead “a double life” as a result of having sex with animals. In my conversations with zoos, leading a life of secrecy was always a very important and painful issue. The following table is an attempt to summarize the participants’ responses:

<u>The Way having Sex with Animals has Changed my Life</u>	<u>Men (79)</u>	<u>Women (11)</u>
Environmental adjustments/changes	25=32%	4=36%
Leading a life of secrecy	22=28%	1= 9%
Positive changes	21=27%	5=45%
Negative changes	15=20%	1= 9%
No change	15=20%	1= 9%

The following are examples for the “Environmental adjustments/changes” category:

— “I am probably not as interested in human contact, socially or sexually as I would be if it was different.”

— “I have only moved to places where I can have my dogs.”

— “I ‘had to’ move out of the city for privacy. They have limited my opportunities to travel/work elsewhere but if I had not had the pleasure of their company I would probably have gone insane or be in jail.”

— “I need more gas because I often drive long distances to the countryside, I need more coffee because I often need the whole night for my amorous adventures.”

— “The main reason I moved to the country in the first place was so that I could get a bit of land and keep my own beasties. I grew up in a small town, and although the countryside was only a few minutes walk away, we never kept the kind of animals that I was deeply attracted to.”

— “Well, I hang around other zoophiles. I live with one. My house has a multitude of animal type memorabilia. I go to zoophile gatherings.”

— “Influence in both my career choice and my home life choice. Zoology and rural surroundings.”

— “Help me picked what I want to do with my life: to work with animals.” And —

— “My life has been influenced in many ways by my sexuality. My tastes in art, some music and some literature has been determined by its content and how it pertains to my sexuality. Certain writers hint at aspects of zoophilia/bestiality in their writing (usually in the fantasy and scifi genre) and so I find myself influenced to read those works. I don’t have much taste for erotica, and I don’t care at all for porn, but I enjoy looking at works of art that have humans and animals and hint at some things going on behind the scenes.”

The following are examples for the “Leading a life of secrecy” category:

— “As a zoo you live two lives. One in which society agrees with, and one society can’t know about. You also have to be careful as to how close you allow some people to get to you, in fear that you might be discovered.”

— “It has made me grow up with yet another ‘secret’ about myself that I felt I couldn’t tell anyone else.”

— “In order to survive emotionally, I have always lead something of a double life: the apparently articulate and outgoing hard-charger on one hand and the lonesome, frightened mistrustful introvert on the other. My ‘zoo’ activities are strictly controlled and circumscribed. I share them with none. They are, however, the main reason why I am now connected to the Internet. I don’t know if I would be connected, even today, if I hadn’t heard a radio talk-show in January of 1995 in which it was more or less casually mentioned that there were zoos on the Internet. ...I now lurk and risk my real life info. only by visiting zoo-related web

sites... My family sees me as a stay-at-home sort of fellow who encourages them to go out and have a good time, see that first-run movie or whatever. It is thus that I gain alone time with my current lover. The romantic side of me, such as it is, is expressed to my animals, not to humans.”

— “It has made me an exceptionally good liar.” And —

— “It has probably increased my tendency to be secretive and distant from mainstream society.”

The following are examples for the “Positive changes” category:

— “It gives me unmatched perspective on human behavior, and I don’t expect or need humans to provide as many emotional needs. That independence has actually strengthened my human relations and general ‘people skills.’”

— “I am even more tolerant of others. I am at ease in my sexuality.”

— “It has made me more open-minded and accepting of others and their life-styles.”

— “I’m more open to people, outgoing, I like to party... No sex though, just good ‘ol fun.”

— “It has helped me overcome my fear of human relationships, so I can form them now and be comfortable in them.”

— “I feel that since I have started (to) have sex with animals as primary partner(s) one part of my life is less complicated.”

— “It has made me a more complete, confident individual... also more sensitive.”

— “It has increased my sexual awareness and how I interact.”

— “In one respect, I attribute a vast benefit to my attraction to animals. Although I never included explicit references to animal sex, in most of my work (designing computer games) throughout the years there have been continuous references to my favorite animals. This made my work very distinctive, and I have garnered a considerable cult following of those who enjoy my work. I’ve been listed in many industry magazines as being ‘well known for an unusual liking for ungulates.’ My animal themes caused my games to stand out from the herd, if you like, and I attribute at least some of the success I have had over the years to allowing my ‘beastie obsession’ to show through in my work :-).”

— “When the death of a (canine) lover forced me to confront my feelings, it ‘opened me up’ and gave me a better understanding of grief and of love, and the importance of discussing them.”

— “It makes me feel that I have an expanded awareness about sex and its possibilities.” And —

— “I don’t put pressure on women as I may have done. My fantasies are more alive.”

The following are examples for the “Negative changes” category:

— “More loss of lovers than a human partner” (animals have a shorter life-span than humans).

— “The feeling of being different ruled my life for a long time.”

— “It’s caused me to feel alone, not understood.”

— “I try to avoid being around any animals, even seeing them — very hard to do...” (this participant reported wanting to stop having sex with animals, but couldn’t).

— “I get very angry and saddened when seeing people treating animals in a bad way.”

— “Having horses keeps me broke. Taking care of the horses also limits my ability to travel.”

— “My finances have been impacted since all the animals eat before any other bills are paid and my social life, while active, is not as active as it would probably be without the animals to care for. I also experience a certain amount of friction with my family over the issue. They don’t know about my ‘unnatural’

attraction for the animals, but they seem to wonder about me, being 30 years old and unmarried and I rarely date women. They sometimes ask when I'm going to find a girlfriend and get married and have kids, and I just tell them I don't have much interest in children, and I have yet to meet the right person... I also wonder if my co-workers find it odd that I don't date."

— "Caused problems with my marriage. Have lost a security clearance when bestiality came up in polygraph test." And —

— "I sought out jobs with horses — keeping myself 'underemployed' for a while."

The following are examples for the "No change" category:

— "None, since I've only had a couple of experiences."

— "It hasn't. I am not in a position to have sex with an animal at this time."

— "Not particularly, since I have always had animals, and always will." And —

— "I've always been inclined to avoid sexual relations with humans. I've had many hours of pleasure engaged in sex with animals; masturbating while thinking about animals; reading books and seeing videos about animal courtship, mating and semen collection; photographing or seeing animal genitals (or pictures of them) especially horses; and reading true or fictional accounts of 'bestiality'."

The Wish to Stop having Sex with Animals (Questions 343-344)

Surprisingly, when asked "If you could, would you like to stop having sex with animals?", only six men (8%) and none of the women reported they would have liked to stop (of the 76 men and eight women who responded to this question). Two of the men who said they would like to stop, had already stopped having sex with animals. They related —

— "It is perverted — have not done it since I was 17." And —

— "Yes, and I have! It took a lot of deep work to clear the shame and trauma associated with being anally raped by my father. This was the source of my anal-focused animal sex with cats, massaging and attempting penetration. As I cleared the trauma and dared tell the truth about the cats, the desire left, gradually but steadily."

The following are what the other four men who reported they would have liked to stop having sex with animals said —

— "I say yes only because of the tremendously devastating personal consequences of being found out. Life would be so much simpler if I did not run that risk. If, however, I could be magically whisked to a place and time where inter-species sex was accepted, I would never want to stop."

— "I do not want to hurt anyone, especially my wife and family."

— "Having sex with my dog is not a regular event. Usually only with extreme frustration with my wife." And —

— "I'd like to stop all sexual activity but masturbation and sex with my wife. The terms of our commitment to each other would be violated otherwise. This doesn't preclude changing those terms though, if done consensually." (This participant never told his wife about his current sexual relations with animals. In other questions, he reported that in the past year, he had sex with an animal once and with two different women).

These explanations suggest that none of the above four men seemed convinced of his wish to stop having sex with animals; all had excuses that had to do with other people, not with what they really wanted for themselves.

The following are examples of what the 70 men and eight women who reported they did not want to stop having sex with animals related —

— “Why? They like it, need it, and deserve it. It makes us closer. I don’t get off when we have sex. It’s for him. I have other ways when needed. Animals are clean, honest, unduplicitous, and full of love. All of us humans can use more of all those.”

— “I could stop anytime — I choose to continue, as I feel this is my sexual identity.”

— “You got to be kidding. I would be crushed.”

— “That would be like asking a heterosexual to stop having sex with women. It’s hideous.”

— “I really can’t explain it; it’s just me. Ask a hetero if they would like to stop having sex... it’s a silly question.”

— ”This is who I am. I refuse to live a lie just to appease others. I must remain true to myself.”

— “The physical pleasure outweighs or is stronger than any moral or societal compaction.”

— “Definitely not! I enjoy it very much, so do the animals, neither my friends or my employers think less of me because of it, and I do not believe it to be unethical. It can be a bit frustrating that the majority of society has yet to emerge from the ethical Dark Ages and still believe that we are somehow nasty individuals, but I believe in my own ethical code sufficiently that I have no desire to give up something that I enjoy so much, and which does no harm to anyone else. I can live an enjoyable life, have many friends and enjoy success in my work, without having to stop enjoying animal sex.”

— “I see no reason to change nor want to. Simply not attracted to people sexually or their body odors, perfume etc.”

— “I like the feeling a dog’s dick up my ass gives me — no other man or woman could ever give me that full feeling.”

— “I love the relationship I have with my mare. It, in some ways, is very special to me. I would not stop that relationship for anything in the world.”

— “Definitely not. There’s nothing wrong in being a zoophile. I love dogs so much, I’m glad that I am a zoophile and I wouldn’t want to be something else.”

— “I do not desire human relations. I am very comfortable with what I am, and even happy most of the time. Why should I change? I don’t hurt anything...”

— “Sex with animals is wonderful, and enriches my life immeasurably.”

— “I would not stop because I enjoy it and it gives me the highest level of intimacy I can achieve.”

— “Once upon a time I’d have said yes. But as I’ve come to understand the emotions underlying the act, I see it as healthy and respectable. I’m proud of my ability to sustain a relationship based on mutual love and care.”

— “I find sex with animals to be thrilling, sexually, intellectually, and spiritually satisfying, and undemanding as far as ‘commitment’ beyond affection, food, shelter, and care are concerned.”

— “If someone offered me the opportunity to take a pill, and by taking that pill I would become a ‘normal’ person with ‘normal’ sexual desires forever and not want to have sex with animals anymore... I would politely laugh at them. I enjoy being who I am, and while I freely admit my sexual tastes are not the norm and that they cause me some amounts of stress most people don’t have to deal with, I would no more choose to change my sexual tastes than I would choose to have another circumcision *grin*.”

— “In 1983 I saw an article on ‘brain drugs’ that would be able to ‘eliminate the sexual deviancy (zoophilia was mentioned).’ I realized then, I loved what I was — and still do. I have no guilt.”

— “I tried to wipe out the zoo aspect of me when I attended church camp when I was 16. I was miserable while I was trying, so I decided that the more love I have the better.”

— “Nowadays it is safer than human/human sex because of the countless STDs that can be contracted as compared with only a few with animals, and besides fur is warmer on cold nights.”

— “I am polygamous by nature and loving one ‘animal’ more, or to the exclusion of the others, would be cruel or insulting to them.”

— “In a nut shell, I have honed my sensitivity to the feelings and emotions of animals in an effort to better understand and bond with them. That makes me a bit over-sensitive to the convoluted ‘mind games’ of so called normal social relations.” And —

— “When one has a comfort that is so secure to one’s life peace of mind, spiritual, satisfying kindness, openness, trust, full interspecies love, after the hell I had in my kind, I stay dolphin all the way!”

Three of the 70 men who reported they would not have wanted to stop having sex with animals related that they no longer had sex with animals, “but would see no reason to stop if (they) were (having sex with animals),” or would have liked to do it again, given the opportunity.

Another man and a woman, who did not respond with a “Yes” or “No” to this question, explained the following —

— “N/A. Medications and age have reduced my libido and ability to function sexually. With maturity I am better able to relate to women, still rather poorly.” And —

— “I no longer do it because I have adolescent girls in the household. Also, I have no partner. For me, it was generally something I did with a partner.”

Two other men who did not respond with a “Yes” or “No” to this question explained the following —

— “It’s wrong, but I like it. Forgive me God.” And —

— “I am not sure at all. This was the question which made me end my last therapy because my therapist tried to force me stopping. If there would be any reasonable alternative for me, I might, but I don’t see any” (I find it surprising that a therapist would try to force someone to stop having sex with animals. Obviously, this could have been the participant’s misperceived perception of what the therapist was trying to convey, or it could have been the participant’s own projections onto the therapist. I guess we will never know).

In summary, 70 men (92% out of 76 who responded) and all eight women (who responded to this question) reported they did not want to stop having sex with animals. Ninety two percent of men and 100 percent of women (or 85% of men and 73% of women out of the whole sample of 82 men and 11 women) make for high numbers of people who do not wish to stop having sex with animals.

CHAPTER 13

IS THERE A SEXUAL ORIENTATION TOWARD ANIMALS?

This was the basic research question for my study. The definition of “sexual orientation” was adapted from Francoeur (1991) in his discussion of homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality. According to this definition, sexual orientation consists of three interrelated aspects: (1) affectional orientation — who or what we bond with emotionally; (2) sexual fantasy orientation — with whom or what we fantasize having sex; and (3) erotic orientation — with whom or what we prefer to have sex. The participants in the current study were asked a variety of questions throughout the questionnaire in an attempt to gather some information about these three major aspects of their relations to animals.

Unfortunately, the participants’ responses could not be statistically analyzed and compared with a non-zoo population, since the current study did not include a control group. Comparing the results of the current study with other studies was not a satisfactory option, since studies of non-zoos do not ask questions about the participants’ feelings, fantasies, and sexual attraction to animals. In addition, the facts that the number of subjects is too small and that the participants were not randomly chosen for the study do not allow for any significant statistical analysis. This lack of statistical analysis renders the study merely a descriptive one (which was the original intent).

The following describes the dependent variable and the three interrelated aspects of sexual orientation as they relate to the participants’ relations to animals.

Having had Sexual Relations With Animals — The Dependent Variable (Questions 198, 212-216, and 301-314)

First we have to look at the dependent variable in this study — having had sexual relations with animals. Eighty-one men and all 11 women who responded to question 198 reported they had sex with animals (the 82nd man neglected to fill-out the page on which this question was written, but throughout the questionnaire it is obvious that he had sexual relations with animals). Seventy-four men (91%) and 10 women (91%) reported they “enjoyed it very much,” five men (6%) “somewhat enjoyed it,” and two men (2%) and one woman (9%) reported “it was O.K.” None of the participants reported he/she “did not like it” or “hated it.”

Fourteen men (17%) and two women reported they were not having sexual relations with animals in the year prior to the study. Of these 14 men, five indicated they did not have sex with animals in the past year only because of situations beyond their control — not because they did not want to have sex with animals. This left a maximum of nine men (11%) in this sample who had completely stopped having sex with animals. Four of them explained that for them sex with animals was merely something they did during adolescence, and one man reported that sex with animals was a way of acting out for him, and now he is “cured.” In other words, a total of 68 men and nine women reported they had sex with animals in the past year, yet a total of 73 men and all 11 women reported they perceived themselves as having sex with animals when possible (overall known as bestialists).

The Existence of Affectional Orientation Toward Animals (Questions 218, 287, 308, 315-316, and 337-338)

Forty-nine men (60%) and six women (67%) reported the sentence “I began having sex with animals because I wanted to express love or affection to the animal” was “completely true” or “mostly true” for them (question 287). This was “reason number three” the men (after sexual attraction and curiosity) and “number two” the women (after sexual attraction) provided as their ground for initiating sexual relations with animals. Eighteen men (22%) and one woman (11%), however, said that this sentence was “not true” for them.

In question 308, fifty men (74%) and six women (67%) reported the sentence “I am currently having sex with animals because I want to express love or affection to the animal” was “completely true” or “mostly true” for them. This was the “number two reason” (after sexual attraction) for both men and women, which they provided as their ground for having sexual relations with animals. Six men (9%) and one woman (11%) reported this sentence was “not true” for them.

Seventy-one men and 10 women responded to question 218 which asked the participants how old were they when they first realized they were psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals. The purpose of this question was to see if the participants would admit they were psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals. Indeed, 71 men (87%) and 10 women (91%) related that they were psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals. Of the 11 men who did not respond to this question, eight commented that they had never been psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals (these included four men who said they were not sexually attracted to animals in questions 217 and 261-269, which makes perfect sense since they are not zoos). The one woman who did not respond to this question, did not respond to the question about sexual attraction to animals as well (217), but went on to report that she was attracted to male canines and equines in questions 261-269.

The following table represents the participants’ responses to the question “how old were you when you first realized that you were psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals?”:

	Average Age	SD	Range	Median	Mode
Men (71)	11.54	7.20	2-37	11	12 (7)
Women (10)	8.37	4.91	4-21	6.85	10 (2)

It is important to note that one man reported here that he was first psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals at age 12, but commented in a subsequent question that he did “not have emotional attachment to animals.”

In questions 315-316, where the participants were asked if they would allow other people to have sex with their animal(s), only 16 men (23%) and four women (40%) reported they would not allow it. It is interesting to note, however, that seven men (10%) and three women (30%) reported they would not allow other people to have sex with their animals since they regarded their animals as mates. Another seven men in this category described love and/or jealous feelings for their animals.

Analysis of the responses of the 76 men and 11 women responding to question 338 which asked the participants to explain why they defined themselves as “bestialists” or “zoophiles,” revealed that the majority of men (59=78%) and women (8=73%) were both “bestialists” and “zoophiles/zoosexuals” (assuming there is no difference between the terms “zoophile” and “zoosexual,” according to the participants’ explanations), since, as some of the participants noted, “a person who has sexual relations with an animal is a bestialist by definition,” and “a person who has a love of animals is a zoophile (or zoosexual), from the dictionary definition (zoos=animals+philos=love).” Only eight men (11%) in the sample appeared to qualify for the definition “bestialist only,” since they seemed to have sex with animals only for the sake of sex.

Obviously, this categorization was subjectively created by me. But more than the actual numbers, what matters is the way the participants explained their views and described their feelings toward their animals. Expressions such as: “I define myself as a zoophile because my relationships with animals are about love and trust — sex is merely an expression of that love” speak for themselves (I encourage you to go back and read the examples of what the participants said in question 338). Even if the numbers are wrong and there are more “bestialists only” and less “zoophiles/zoosexuals,” the participants’ reports speak for themselves: There were some participants who seemed to be in-love with their animals, and there were others who seemed to have no emotional attraction to animals.

The Existence of Sexual Fantasy About having Sex With Animals (Questions 180-182, 220, and 293)

Question 293 revealed that for the majority of men (57=70%) and women (7=64%), sexual fantasies about having sex with animals contributed, on some level, to their first sexual encounter with an animal. This

means that these participants were fantasizing about having sex with animals before they actually had sex with animals.

In question 180, it appeared that the majority of men (61=76%) “primarily” or “always” fantasized about having sex with animals. This fantasy was far more popular than any other sexual fantasy reported by the men. Only four men reported they “never” fantasized about it, and one man reported he “rarely” fantasized about having sex with animals, compared with 19 men who never fantasized about having sex with a woman, and 36 men who never fantasized about having sex with a man. Three of the men who reported not fantasizing about having sex with animals reported in subsequent questions that they no longer engage in sexual relations with animals.

Almost half the women (5=45%) too, fantasized “primarily” or “always” about having sex with animals, while the only other popular sexual fantasies mentioned by the women involved watching other humans have sex with animals (40%) and having sex with a man (27%). None of the women reported she “never” fantasized about having sex with animals, and only one woman said she “rarely” fantasized about it.

Again, the participants’ reports speak for themselves: The majority of participants fantasized about having sex with animals, and a few did not. More importantly, the majority of participants began fantasizing about having sex with animals before they had their first sexual encounter with an animal.

**The Existence of Erotic Orientation Toward Animals
(Questions 217, 219-220, 261-269, 289, 310, 337-338, 340, and 343-344)**

As was seen in questions 261-269, all but four men (which makes for 78 men), and all 11 women reported being attracted to certain animals. The main question, though, did not specify sexual attraction to animals, it only asked “To what animals are you most attracted?”

In question 289, sixty-two men (76%) and seven women (70%) reported the sentence “I began having sex with animals because I was sexually attracted to the animal” was “completely true” or “mostly true” for them. This, in fact, was the “number one reason” the participants provided for this question. Only eight men (10%) and one woman (10%) said that this sentence was “not true” for them. Among the open-ended answers to question 220, fifteen men (19%) and one woman listed sexual attraction to the animal as the motivating factor in their first sexual encounter with an animal. Another four men (5%) and four women (36%) related that for them sex with animals “was the natural thing to do.”

In question 310, sixty-two men (91%) and nine women (100%) reported the sentence “I am currently having sex with animals because I am sexually attracted to the animal” was “completely true” or “mostly true” for them. Again, this was the “number one reason” the participants provided for this question. Only three men (4%) and none of the women said that this sentence was “not true” for them.

In question 217, the participants were asked how old were they when they first realized they were sexually attracted to animals. The purpose of this question was to see if the participants will admit they were sexually attracted to animals. Indeed, 78 men (95%) and 10 women (91%) admitted they were sexually attracted to animals. The same four men who did not respond to questions 261-269, nor to question 218 which asked about psychological/emotional attraction to animals, did not respond to this question as well, which, as mentioned before, makes perfect sense since they are not zoos. The same woman who did not respond to question 218, and in questions 261-269 reported she was attracted to male canines and equines, remarked here that she was never attracted to animals. The following table depicts the participants’ responses to question 217:

	Average Age	SD	Range	Median	Mode
Men (78)	13.08	5.10	3-45	13	14 (18)
Women (10)	13.10	3.14	9-20	13	13 (3)

In question 340, nineteen men (27%) and three women (38%) reported believing that bestiality was not a perversion because for them it was the natural thing to do and/or it was like a sexual orientation. And, in questions 343-344, seventy men (85%) and eight women (73%) reported they did not want to stop having sex with animals, mostly because zoophilia was part of who they were, and they liked that.

It is also interesting to note that nine men commented (throughout the questionnaire) about their attraction to animals' pheromones. For example, one of them related —

— “I enjoy stimuli that are not often found in human sexual relationships; for example, I am highly turned on by olfactory stimuli, and humans by convention rarely allow themselves to have any natural human aroma. Artificial perfumes leave me completely cold, as do conventional standards of ‘attractiveness’ and ‘beauty.’ There is something altogether more straightforward and earthy in the experience of animal sex, and it is that which I seek in my sexual activities.”

Another man commented that his “order of sexual preference is consistent with the sexual appeal of a species sexual fragrance.” This is an example of sexual/chemical attraction on a very basic/biological level.

As mentioned above, analysis of the responses of the 76 men and 11 women responding to question 338 which asked the participants to explain why they defined themselves as “bestialists” or “zoophiles,” revealed that the majority of men (59=78%) and women (8=73%) were both “bestialists” and “zoophiles/zoosexuals.” Only eight men (11%) in the sample appeared to qualify for the definition “bestialist only,” since they seemed to have sex with animals only for the sake of sex — not because they were sexually attracted to the animals.

Again, this categorization was subjectively created by me. But the numbers don't really matter; what matters is the way the participants explained their views and described their feelings toward their animals. Expressions such as: “While I have lust for a large number of animals, it is the relationship formed with the animal that is the important part” (I encourage you to go back and read the examples of what the participants said in question 338). Even if the numbers are wrong and there are more “bestialists only” and less “zoophiles/zoosexuals,” the participants' reports speak for themselves: There were some participants who seemed to have sexual feelings toward animals, and there were others who seemed to have no sexual feelings toward animals.

One man (in question 346 which asked “How would your life be different if you had a close intimate/sexual relationship with a human being?”) related the following —

— “...I am zoo exclusive and the very thought of having sex with a human disgusts me. Ask a homosexual if he wants to have sex with someone of the opposite gender.”

Eighty-one men and all 11 women responded to question 219, where they were asked to rate themselves on a Kinsey-like scale, describing the participants' sexual inclinations toward humans vs. animals. The participants were asked to take into consideration both actual sexual behavior and fantasy. More than half of the men (48=58%) perceived themselves as having more sexual inclinations toward animals than humans (between 4 and 6 — see below). The majority of the women (9=82%), however, perceived themselves as being sexually inclined to both humans and animals (between 2 and 4 — see below). The following table depicts the participants' responses about their sexual inclinations:

Sexual Inclination	Men (81)	Women (11)
0=Exclusively with human beings	2= 2%	0
1=Only incidental animal sex	6= 7%	1= 9%
2=Both animal sex and human sex, but more human sex	14=17%	4=36%
3=Equally animal and human sex:	12=15%	3=27%
4=Both animal sex and human sex, but more animal sex:	15=19%	2=18%
5=Only incidental human sex:	22=27%	1= 9%
6=Exclusively animal sex:	10=12%	0

The findings of this question, supported by the above related questions, clearly indicate that different people have different levels of sexual inclination toward animals. “Is there a sexual orientation toward non-human animals?” — yes, so it appears. This study did not provide the prevalence rate for the people who have this sexual orientation, nor did it provide the causes for having such a sexual orientation. However, it very clearly shows that some people (the majority of the participants in the current study) have feelings of love and affection for their animals, have sexual fantasies about them, and admit they are sexually attracted to them.

Understanding Bestiality and Zoophilia

Sexual orientation, as we know it, can be fluid and changing with time and circumstances. People are not “black or white.” We can place people on all levels of the Kinsey scale, even when we apply this scale to sexual orientation toward animals. It is logical to assume that the majority of the human race will be placed around the zero point of this Kinsey-like scale (sexual inclination exclusively with human beings), but the current study shows that there are some humans whose place on this Kinsey-like scale is definitely not zero. In fact, there are some (probably very few) individuals whose place on this scale would be the other extreme (6=sexual inclination exclusively with animals).

CHAPTER 14

LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY

It is important to remember that the findings of this study cannot be generalized to other zoos or bestialists. This study merely describes the lives and some of the behaviors of its 93 participants, as it intended to be an exploratory, descriptive study. Moreover, the study had some inherent flaws and limitations. It is, therefore, imperative to discuss these limitations.

The Study is Not Representative

This research project was a descriptive study, based on questionnaires which were filled out by 82 men and 11 women. The study relied on available subjects who volunteered to participate in it and were not randomly chosen. Thus the results of the current study cannot be generalized. The results apply only to the population studied, and due to the sample size, especially the women's, the findings cannot be statistically significant. However, the study provided some valuable information on the life and sexual behaviors of people who engage in sexual relations with animals from which future studies can be drawn.

The study did not have a control group and all the subjects had sexual relations with animals (which was the dependent variable). Thus, the issue of prevalence of bestiality among the sample became irrelevant, and comparisons between subjects who had sex with animals and those who had not, were not available. This, in fact, was not the intention of my study, yet is listed here as a limitation because the study could have yielded important statistical data if the results of the current study could have been compared with answers of people who did not have sex with animals.

The majority of subjects (73%) found out about the study through the Internet, which means they were sophisticated enough to use both a personal computer and the Internet. The zoos on the Internet may have been more open about their sexual behaviors with animals, about sexuality in general, and about participating in this study as a result of exposure to the Internet and to their peers. It is important to keep in mind that if the sample had been made of more people outside the Internet, the results might have been different.

Validity and Reliability

Other than a short telephone conversation with the volunteers for the study to verify authenticity, and making sure they sent me back the original questionnaire I sent to them, I had no guarantees the subjects were who they said they were, or that their answers were genuine. Although the questionnaires included some repeated questions with different wording to ensure reliability, there is still a chance that subjects may have been lying or under or over reporting in some of their answers. For example, participant AE=31 reported, in questions 259-260, that he had sexual relations with five male lions, four female lions, 40 male tigers, eight female tigers, one male deer, and 12 female deer, among other animals. This is hard to believe. On the other hand, I did have the opportunity to get to know the participant who reported having sex with a rhinoceros, and his story sounded believable to me (he used to work in a zoo). So, who knows?

I can only hope that a person who took the time to fill out an anonymous 350-item, 23-page-long questionnaire which included open-ended questions, and then sent it back to me, was not doing it just for the fun of sabotaging the study.

Questions in the Questionnaire

Another limitation of the study is the use of open-ended questions which were primarily analyzed and categorized by me. Although a few of my colleagues assisted in deciding on the different categories for each answer, it seems inevitable that in the majority of cases, it was my subjective opinion that ruled.

In some cases, such as in question 322, which asked the participants to describe the reactions of the people who knew about their sexual relations with animals, it was very difficult to understand what exactly the participants wanted to convey in their responses, and thus the categories overlapped. Another example is question 345, which asked “How has the fact that you have had sex with animals influenced your life-style?” Here, the responses tended to be short, hence did not provide enough data to appropriately categorize the information.

Moreover, some responses, such as the ones given for question 345, may have been considered “positive” by the participants, given the opportunity to state their opinion, but were considered “negative” by me, and vice versa.

When it came to the structured questions in the questionnaire, such as the Kinsey scale (question 166) or the introvert-extrovert scale (question 52), the participants’ answers were obviously subjective, and therefore may not have been accurate. When the participants were asked to define themselves in terms of being a “bestialist” and/or a “zoophile,” it appeared that they perceived themselves and the various definitions in different ways (making it very confusing). Analysis of their explanations revealed different results from what the participants reported; when the participants’ answers were analyzed not subjectively by them, but according to my definitions of bestiality and zoophilia (“bestialist” is anyone who has sex with animals, and “zoophile/zoosexual” is someone who is sexually and/or emotionally attracted to animals), the majority of participants (59=78% men & 8=73% women) were categorized as “both bestialists and zoophiles/zoosexuals” compared with 40 men (50%) and six women (60%) who had reported they were “zoophiles” and 25 men (31%) and none of the women who had reported they were “both bestialists and zoophiles/zoosexuals.”

The same occurred when the participants were asked if they were abused while growing up. When the participants were asked to describe their abuse, it turned out that 36 men (46%) rather than 33 (42%) were emotionally abused. Although only three women (30%) reported they were sexually abused during childhood, from their descriptions, it turned out that four women (36%) were sexually molested during childhood. The largest difference was seen in the men’s reports about childhood sexual abuse. Although only 13 men (17%) reported they were sexually abused as children, after analyzing the men’s descriptions and when taking into account the broad definition of childhood sexual abuse, which means — engaging in any sexual behavior or subjecting the child to a sexual behavior with or by a person who is at least five years older than the child, it turned out that 33 men (40%) were sexually abused during their childhood.

Some questions were not worded clearly enough, and resulted in incomplete data. Questions 70 and 71 asked, for example: “Did you grow up on a farm?” and “Do you currently live on a farm?” respectively. However, I neglected to ask specifically if they grew up or if they currently live in a rural or an urban area. This was a major limitation of the study since it prevented me from gauging the rural/urban living environment of the participants; some, for example, may not live on a farm and yet live in a rural area with farm animals.

Another example is question 201, where 61 men (76%) and nine women (82%) reported they saw other people doing sexual things. This question was supposed to screen for tendencies of voyeurism, but it seemed that the way the question was worded misled the participants to respond to whether they ever saw another person do something sexual. Therefore, although 36 men (59%) and seven women (78%) reported they “enjoyed it very much” or “somewhat enjoyed it,” these data can not really mean anything.

Questions 192 and 193 asked whether the participants ever performed anal sex on a human partner or received anal sex from a human partner, respectively, and how they felt about it if they did. The questions, however, did not distinguish between genders: anal sex can be performed by females as well as by males; women can insert fingers and other objects into the anus and thus perform anal sex on men and women. Since the questions were not gender specific, the data gathered from them were not complete nor satisfactory.

Question 144, too, asked whether the participants ever had sexual relations with their cousin(s) and how old they were when it started. The question, however, failed to distinguish between female cousins and male cousins, and resulted in incomplete data.

My Bias

Although researcher's bias is a common phenomenon, it is important to discuss my own bias within the framework of this study's limitations. While conducting the study, I was worried that the friendly relationships I was developing with some of my subjects would hinder my ability to objectively report my findings. Therefore, I conducted the study as a double-blind one, where I did not know the identity of the person responding. I also tried very hard to ask questions in the questionnaire that would reveal those zoos who might not be as intelligent, interesting, friendly, and happy about being zoos as the ones I met in the gathering and as those who opened up to me through the telephone seemed to be. Obviously, my positive experiences with zoos biased me — I cannot deny this, but I have tried to remain objective and to report only what was reported to me in the questionnaires.

Moreover, as a sex therapist, I believe that sex is inherently good, and one of its main purposes is to provide pleasure. I further believe that as long as an individual does not harm anyone, anything consensual goes. The key is "consent"!

For myself, I find nothing remotely exciting about sexual relations with animals. My bias is not about bestiality, but rather against discrimination and hatred of people who are misunderstood. I now know many nice, intelligent, friendly, and good people, who have sex with animals. Some of them prefer animals as sex partners to humans. They tell me they love their animals and would do anything for them. They tell me they won't have sex with their animals unless the animal shows them, with its body language, that it wants it and enjoys it.

I don't advocate for or condone individuals' decisions to engage in sexual behavior with their animals, but I also don't feel it is in my power to condemn it. As long as they don't hurt their animal sex partners, I believe they are free to do whatever they want.

And if one were to say that these people manipulate their animals and use their power over them to have sexual relations with them, I agree. Animal owners manipulate their animals and use their power over them all the time, to do lots of things. Society tends to accept that, except when it comes to sex.

Let me share with you a letter I received in January of 2000 from a concerned woman who, like many others, misunderstood my intentions:

"Dear Dr. Miletski,

I am writing in regard to the fact that you actively promote acceptance of bestiality and zoophism as 'alternative lifestyles.' As an animal lover I find this as reprehensible as it is incomprehensible.

Surely you must be aware that in any acceptable sexual relationship the element of consent is essential, and one that is totally missing in human-animal relations. The animals are not free to decline or accept but must acquiesce to what ever the human wants. Your focus, then, is completely upon the human and his 'desires' while the animals are viewed as objects to achieve satisfaction no matter the cost to them. In this you mirror the attitudes of many in our culture who view animals as nothing but 'things' to be used by humans as they wish. This despite the fact that research on free-living (wild) animals indicates they are much more intelligent, aware, and sensitive to what's going on around them than previously thought, have complex emotional lives, and experience complex relationships with others of their own species.

However, even most people in our society would stop short of viewing animals as acceptable sex objects.

Despite what zoophiles tell themselves and claim to others: that the act is consensual and that the animal 'enjoys' it, the fact is that this is an act of violence committed by the strong over the weak. As such it should be recognized as the violence against and abuse of animals that it is. Laws should accordingly be passed to protect animals from it, and perpetrators should be actively encouraged to turn from it.

Furthermore, I assume you are unaware of the vast body of research which documents that people who abuse animals are very likely to go on and abuse humans, and which describes the strong correlation between bestiality and other violent crimes.

Yours truly,

..."

Here is my answer to her letter:

"January 4, 2000

Dear Ms....,

Thank you for your letter dated December 29, 1999. It always makes me feel good to know there are people out there like you (and the majority of the people in my study) who care so much about animals that they go out of their way to make sure no harm is done to animals. I really appreciate your letter; it shows you really care.

I am, however, completely dumbfounded that you accuse me of promoting bestiality. Where did you come up with this idea? Does a researcher studying the phenomenon of homelessness, for example, promote homelessness? Does a researcher studying the phenomenon of obesity, as another example, promote obesity?

I have never condoned sex with animals. As a researcher, I try to stay neutral and simply present my findings and my research-subjects' answers. I became interested in this phenomenon while trying to help one of my clients in my psychotherapy practice stop having sex with animals. I felt I did not know enough about this behavior to objectively treat my client, and as I realized there was almost no literature about this subject, I decided to gather my own data.

I believe my work contributed immensely to the fields of sexology, anthropology, social psychology, and behavioral science. Most of the data I gathered are new information that can begin to give sexologists and other professionals elementary knowledge about the relatively unexplored and misunderstood lives and behaviors of individuals who have sexual relations with animals.

Thus, you are right; my focus in the study was completely upon the human and his/her 'desires.' I am not a veterinarian; I work with and study humans. I do not know how to communicate with animals, and I do not know how to ask them about the very important issue of consent.

I can only go by what my subjects told me: The majority of my subjects love their animal-partner. Some see them as a spouse and will do anything for them. Sexual relations with the animal is an expression of love for them, and if the animal tells them, with it's body language, that it is not in the mood for love-making, the majority of my subjects will leave the animal alone. In fact, many of them are members of the Humane Society and other organizations that are taking care of animals. Let me share with you a few quotes from what my subjects have said:

— 'I define myself as a zoophile because my relationships with animals are about love and trust; sex is merely an expression of that love. It is consensual and pleasurable for both parties, and either party can decline with appropriate body language. Even if sex were no longer possible with them, I would still love and adore them just as much.'

— 'I don't just value the sex. I love and cherish my animal partners as I would a human partner.'

— 'I care for the animal as much or even more than I would a person. In fact, I've married my mare in a private way. I'd do anything to keep her just like a wife.' And —

— 'The animals with whom I have had long-term relationships enjoy the sex as much, or more than do I. Animals who object to my advances are not approached again. Those who simply submit, allowing me to have my way with them but who show no reaction to my advances are not approached again. I want active participation... When the family and I are sitting around in the evening watching a video and she walks up, bold as brass, and begins to frantically lick my face and rub the insides of her lips against my cheek, when she then turns around, presents her rear end and moves that long tail to one side and if still ignored, sits in my lap and starts dry-humping my crotch in front of God and everybody, I assume she wants sex. When the family is gone and she paces from my side to the bedroom door and back, thrusts her muzzle between my legs and licks my crotch, then paces to the bedroom door again, I assume she wants to go to bed and not for sleeping, either. And when I begin the ritual by licking her muzzle and eyes, sliding my hand along her belly and making the vocalizations I always make when asking for sex and she rumbles deep in her chest, gives my face a perfunctory lick and pushes me away with her fore-paws, I assume she's saying 'not right now, dear.' My current lover stands 32 inches high at the shoulder. When she stands on her rear legs, she's well over six feet tall. She has a full-blown set of claws and teeth that can destroy any item that takes her fancy within minutes. She weighs around 140 lbs. I have personally seen her pull down a full-grown 180-lb human male attempting to break into our house and hold him flat on his back, sounding and looking like the very devil incarnate. Now I assume she didn't want this scumbag in my home, and she was able to completely control the intruder. Doesn't it make sense, then, to assume that if she didn't want me messing around with her private parts she could and would make that fact abundantly and undeniably clear?'

As a psychotherapist, I am very much aware of the fact that people who abuse animals are very likely to go on and abuse humans. Indeed, there are people who engage in sexual activities with animals in an abusive manner, and some of them go on to abuse humans (some of them stay away from humans as long as they have animals to abuse). However, I wonder if individuals such as the people who wrote the above quotes are involved in

abusive sex with animals. I think before we can generalize and judge people for their behaviors, we should first learn more about what they actually do and about their relationships with their animal-partners.

I agree with you, again, that in many situations ‘animals are not free to decline or accept but must acquiesce to whatever the human wants.’ This really upsets me, especially when it comes to people who leave their pets alone all day in a little apartment when they go to work — the animals never agreed to that. And the people who take their animals to the veterinarian to ‘get fixed’ — the animals never agreed to that. Or the people who put their animals to sleep when they are sick — the animals never agreed to that. In fact, if individuals did any of these behaviors to another human being, they would be arrested, charged and convicted for neglect, abuse, and murder. Maybe ‘laws should accordingly be passed to protect animals from these behaviors, and perpetrators (probably most pets owners) should be actively encouraged to turn from it.’

Sincerely,

Hani Miletski, M.S.W., Ph.D.
Psychotherapist & Clinical Sexologist”

Suggestions for Future Studies

This study was a descriptive one and had some inherent flaws, thus its findings cannot be generalized or even considered significant. However, it provided some important insights into the lives of 82 men and 11 women who had sexual relations with animals. In many ways, this study was a breakthrough since nothing like this has ever been done and most of the data are new information that can begin to fill the void sexologists have been experiencing about the phenomena of bestiality and zoophilia.

This study has already opened doors for other studies, and currently there are two research projects being done about zoophilia: one by a psychology doctoral student from the University of Erlangen in Germany, Ms. Andrea Beetz, and the other by Drs. Martin Weinberg and Colin Williams from Indiana University at Bloomington, Indiana. I sent them a copy of my study, and I wish them all the best. I hope other researchers will follow their path.

Since there are many inherent flaws in the current study, the following are my suggestions for future studies —

— Future studies about people who have had sexual relations with animals should try to have a larger sample size so that further statistical analysis could be employed.

— The sample should be a random sample so that findings can be generalized.

— The study should have a control group so that findings could be compared with individuals who have not had sex with animals.

— A face-to-face interview rather than a self-administered questionnaire, may assure both the participants’ understanding of the questions, and the researchers’ understanding of their responses in a more objective manner. (This may, however, impinge on the researcher’s ability to stay objective/un-biased).

— More attention should be given to the wording of the questions and to categorizing the responses.

— Standardized tests could be employed in future studies, where data from the general population is available/known, so that comparison between the general population and people who have had sex with animals could be accomplished. One option is to deliver tests such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) which can provide information about the participants’ mental health status. Other personality tests can

be employed to find out about personality disorders, and cruelty to animals. (Ms. Beetz has been using personality tests as part of her questionnaire).

— Finally, future studies may wish to duplicate the current study by using the same questionnaire or by developing other tools to measure sexual orientation toward non-human animals. (From what I have seen when one zoo emailed me Drs. Weinberg and Williams' questionnaire, his questions are very similar to mine, yet more elaborate).

CHAPTER 15

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER STUDIES

The most relevant and important studies for comparison purposes with the current study are: Kinsey *et al.*'s (1948) study on the sexual behaviors of American men; Kinsey *et al.*'s (1953) study on the sexual behaviors of American women; the Gebhard *et al.*'s (1965) study on sex offenders; the Hunt survey (1974); Peretti and Rowan's (1983) study; and Donofrio's (1996) doctoral dissertation. Some of their data are compared with the data gathered in the current study.

Kinsey *et al.* (1948) relate that animal sexual contacts are largely confined to farm boys, and estimate that between 40 to 50 percent of all farm boys engage in this behavior. Hunt (1974) agrees with Kinsey *et al.* (1948) that bestiality is more prevalent among men in rural areas. For women, Hunt suggests, the place of residence does not play a major role in influencing bestiality; women may turn to experimental contact with animals in desperation, when they have no available partner. In the current study, only 22 men (27%) and three women (27%) grew up on a farm, and only 16 men (20%) and one woman (9%) reported living on a farm at the time of the study. However, the participants were not asked specifically if they grew up or if they were living in a rural or an urban area. This was a major limitation of the current study since it made it impossible to gauge the rural/urban living environment of the participants; some, for example, might have not grown up or lived on a farm and yet lived in a rural area with farm animals.

Kinsey *et al.* (1948) report that bestiality is highest among boys who live in rural areas and who ultimately go to college. More specifically, they say, over half of the rural males who have a college education, have had some kind of sexual contact with animals. In the current study, almost half the men (39=48%) and women (5=45%) are college graduates or above.

According to Hunt (1974) and Kinsey *et al.* (1948 & 1953), those individuals who had any sexual contact with animals were most likely to have them between the onset of adolescence and age 15, while tapering off the behavior until reaching adulthood. In the current study, the men reported they began having sex with animals between the ages of three and 25, with an average age of 13.16. The women reported they began having sex with animals between the ages of eight and 47, with an average age of 19.55. The majority of participants (73 men=89% and nine women=82%) in the current study reported they were still having sex with animals, although all have reached adulthood.

Kinsey *et al.* (1948) report that up to age 15, boys who engage in bestiality do so for a maximum of eight times a week. By age 30, the figure drops to once a week. The current study did not ask about the frequency of bestiality during adolescence, however it did provide information about the frequency of bestiality during the year prior to the study — during adulthood. According to the participants' reports, the men had sexual relations with animals between once a year to three times a day, with an average of 2.96 times per week. The women had sexual relations with animals between once a month to once a day, with an average of 1.80 times per week. The majority of men (56=68%) and women (7=64%) in the current study were older than 30 years of age at the time of the study.

According to Kinsey *et al.* (1948), vaginal intercourse and masturbation of the animal by the boy, followed by fellatio of the boy, are the most common practices for males. According to Hunt (1974), a third of the men had vaginal intercourse with an animal, a third had an animal perform oral sex on them, and another third had masturbated the animal or have masturbated themselves by rubbing their genitals against the animal. In the current study, when it came to female animals, the men reported they had vaginal-penile intercourse with the animal (45=55%), masturbated the animal (31=38%), and performed cunnilingus on the animal (27=34%). When it came to male animals, the men reported they masturbated the animal (52=64%), performed fellatio on the animal (33=42%), and submitted to anal intercourse performed by the animal (27=34%).

According to Hunt (1974) and Kinsey *et al.* (1953), the most common sexual activity for women was general body contact with the animal. In the current study, when it came to male animals, the women reported they masturbated the male animal (7=64%), had the animal perform cunnilingus on them (6=55%), had vaginal-

penile intercourse with the animal (6=55%), and performed fellatio on the animal (5=45%). When it came to female animals, the women reported they had the female animal perform cunnilingus on them (4=36%).

Kinsey *et al.* (1948) found calves, burros and sheep to be the animals most often involved in bestiality for men, although, they say, all the species that are domesticated or kept as pets are potential partners as well. Most women had sexual contact with dogs (Kinsey *et al.*, 1953). According to Hunt (1974), dogs were the chosen species in the majority of cases among women as well as men. The current study agreed with Hunt's findings. The most popular animal sex partner the men (74=90%) and the women (11=100%) reported was a male dog. Second in line for the men (59=72%) and for the women (8=73%) was a female dog. Thirdly, the men (44=54%) and the women (6=55%) reported male equines. The men reported female equines (43=52%) as their next most popular animal sex partner, and the women reported male cats (3=27%).

Gebhard *et al.* (1965), in their study of sex offenders, report they have found Kinsey *et al.*'s (1948) figure of eight percent bestiality prevalence among men to be true in their control group and in the heterosexual offenders against adults group (8%). The other offender groups these authors studied, showed higher rates of bestiality, which led the authors to conclude that sex offenders, especially homosexual offenders and heterosexual aggressors against minors, tend to engage in bestiality.

The current study did not focus on sex offenders, however, it did reveal five men (7%) who reported that having sex with children is a "primary" sexual fantasy of theirs. Two other men and one woman reported they "sometimes" fantasized about having sex with children, and two men commented that they like fantasies about pedophilia. Eight men (10%) and one woman (9%) reported they had sex with children who were at least five years younger than the participants were at the time. Six of these men (75%) and the woman reported they "enjoyed it very much" or "somewhat enjoyed it," and the two other men reported "it was O.K.."

The current study further revealed a high number of homosexual tendencies among its participants. Sixty-three men (77%) reported they had sexual contact with other men (this number supposedly includes abuse incidents as well), and eight women (73%) reported they had sexual contact with another woman. Nevertheless, (in question 166) the majority of men (57=72%) and women (8=73%) rated themselves as heterosexually inclined (between 0 and 2) on the Kinsey scale. According to Kinsey *et al.* (1948), 37 percent of the total men population has "at least some overt homosexual experience to the point of orgasm between adolescence and old age" (p. 650). According to Kinsey *et al.* (1953), by age forty, 19 percent of women in their sample had some physical contact with other women.

Peretti and Rowan (1983) found that for the men in their study, "sexual expressiveness" was the most common factor related to sustained practice of "chronic zoophilia." The men, as well as the women, in this category maintained that this practice was the most convenient for them because it lacked the civilized pretense they had experienced in human sexual contact. The men further reported that sex with animals allowed them greater freedom in their sexual behaviors with much less difficulty in persuasion and performance as compared with human partners. Both the men and women stated that "zoophilia" was comparable to a form of masturbation; it was helpful during depressive periods or when they had no human sexual partner available. It provided them with a level of pleasure hard to achieve in a conventional sexual manner, and it was helpful for married subjects in keeping them from seeking extramarital sexual experiences.

In the current study, the equivalent of "sexual expressiveness" did not rank high among the different reasons the participants provided as explanations for their sexual relations with animals. This probably resulted from the fact that they had at least 14 options to choose from, including sexual attraction and wanting "to express love or affection to the animal" which ranked first and second place respectively, while Peretti and Rowan gave their participants only six options. Nevertheless, in the current study, 27 men (40%) and one woman (11%) reported they were having sex with animals because they wanted to relieve sexual tension. Twenty-six men (39%) and one woman reported they were having sex with animals because they felt they could "only trust animals." Seventeen men (25%) wanted "to experience something else." Ten men (15%) reported they had sex with animals because they were lonely. Eight men (12%) reported they had sex with animals because they had "no human partners available," and five men (7%) reported they were "too shy to have sex with humans."

The men in the Peretti and Rowan's study (1983) engaged in sexual fantasy (unrelated to bestiality) while engaging in sexual relations with animals more frequently than did the women (ranked second for the

men and fifth for the women). Both the men and women maintained that they would almost always help arouse themselves and bring themselves to orgasm through sexual fantasies. In the current study, fantasies about “having sex with animals” were very popular. In fact, this was the “number one” sexual fantasy the men (61=76%) and the women (5=45%) reported. The “number two” sexual fantasy for both the men (27=35%) and the women (4=40%) was “watching other humans have sex with animals.” And the “number three” sexual fantasy for both the men (22=28%) and the women (3=27%) was “having sex with a human being of the opposite gender.”

In the Peretti and Rowan’s study (1983), “no negotiation” ranked third for both men and women. They stated that the use of animals for sexual gratification was simple and straightforward without the need to bargain and play “mind games.” In the current study, indeed, 45 men (67%) and five women (56%) reported they were “having sex with animals because the animal(s) is/are accepting and easy to please.” This factor ranked third for both men (after sexual attraction and wanting “to express love or affection to the animal”) and women (after sexual attraction and two “number two reasons:” wanting “to express love or affection to the animal” and “the animal(s) want(s) it.”

For the women in the Peretti and Rowan’s study (1983), “emotional involvement” was the most frequently given response for sustaining their “zoophilia,” while for the men it was the least frequent response. The women reported they tended to develop an attachment and affection for their animal sex partners, yet the authors de-emphasize their reports and explain these feelings as a common phenomenon of pet owners. They conclude that there is little reason to assume that the emotions and feelings people develop about animal companions are any less deep than those they develop toward other people, yet they ignore the idea that “emotional involvement” may be a reason for people to have sexual relations with animals. In the current study, wanting “to express love or affection to the animal” was “reason number two” for having sex with animals for both men (50=74%) and women (6=67%).

In Donofrio’s study (1996), initial sexual contact with an animal, for each of its eight participants, was prompted by curiosity or sexual exploration, and recurred due to the resulting satisfaction. In the current study, curiosity (55=67%) was the second reason after sexual attraction the men provided as an explanation for their initial sexual contact with an animal. Wanting “to experience something else” (which can be seen as sexual exploration) ranked seven (31=38%). For the women, curiosity (7=70%) was the “number one reason” together with sexual attraction, they provided as an explanation for their initial sexual contact with an animal. Wanting “to experience something else” ranked four (6=67%).

CHAPTER 16

A CLOSER LOOK AT SOME OF THE PARTICIPANTS

I promised the participants in the study that their answers will be anonymous, and I have kept my promise. However, I would like to provide you with a closer look at who some of these participants are so that you will be able to maybe better understand them. In this chapter, I describe two women and 13 men participants in more detail. It was difficult to decide who these two women and 13 men would be, since each participant has a unique story, with different backgrounds, experiences, thoughts, and feelings. I therefore randomly chose the case-studies in this section. The only case-study not randomly chosen involved the man who raped and killed animals (since I promised to elaborate on this case). Obviously, I changed the participants' names and modified some identifying details to maintain their anonymity.

“The stallions are usually happy to play at the drop of a hat”

“Barry” was a 30-year-old single man. He worked as a marketing manager for a technology company. He was raised by both his parents, and related having five close friends whom he met or talked with “monthly or more frequently.” He rated himself as a “2” on the sociability scale. Barry was a vegetarian “out of respect for the animal, a dislike of contributing to animal suffering, and the realization that feeding animals for human consumption wastes resources and contributes to worldwide food shortages.” He did not grow up on a farm, but at the time of the study he did live on a farm and had a variety of animals.

He had had two men sex partners, the first at the age of 12, but none during the year prior to the study. He had had nine different women sex partners, the first at age 18. During the year prior to the study he had sexual relations once with a woman. Barry reported having had about 370 different animal sex partners, and in the year prior to the study he had about 20 different animal sex partners. He reported having sex with animals about six times per week. Barry rated himself as a “5=only incidental human sex” on the Kinsey-like scale of sexual orientation toward animals.

Barry provided elaborated and illuminated answers to the questions in the questionnaire. The following are some of his responses —

“Sexual abuse: There were a few incidents in my childhood (ages 5-8) when I strongly suspect I was the victim of sexual abuse by my grandmother. She would do things like ask me if I wanted her to help wipe off my penis after urinating, which I always refused politely. She seemed overly fond of bathing me as well. On visits she would expect me to spend the night with her. I always dreaded that for some reason, but I had blocked most of the details out of my mind until I reached the age of 19, when it was brought out of me by a therapist.

Seems she would always ask me to share the bed with her, and she sleeps in the nude. I don't have any clear recollection of what happened while in bed with her save several memories of laying next to her nude wrinkly body, and me feeling very small and uncomfortable. I always detested the smell of her perfume as well... As to what may have gone on, I have vague memories of being hugged and kissed, and possibly fondled though I won't swear to it. I do have very clear memories of thinking this was perhaps not appropriate behavior for a child, and that I felt I was deferring to her wishes as a child is supposed to do for an elder.

My parents told me that I had mentioned some incidents to them as a child but I don't recall them ever doing anything about it. I recall my mom got pissed, but I don't think she ever confronted my grandmother with it. Again, much of what transpired has been lost in time, or I somehow buried it.

Physical/emotional abuse: My father had a really short temper during my childhood and would often freak out about something relatively inconsequential that we kids had done. He would often use abusive language while he was scolding us, make physical threats (one I recall very well was ‘I'm going to beat you to within an inch of your life!!’). Often he would make good on those threats, though he never beat us so hard we

wound up needing a physician's care. His weapon of choice was the dreaded leather belt (the buckle end, not the strap). He also had really dreadful aim when he was worked up and we (myself and my brother) would sometimes wind up with welts on our thighs and lower backs as well as our buttocks. I remember being dragged down the stairs by my hair once or twice too...

I have dealt with my father about those issues and he has at least apologized and admitted his behavior was excessive. Dad and I have a pretty good relationship these days, though I don't know if I'll ever tell him about the animals. I can't help but wonder if he ever suspects. What does any of this have to do with the fact that I'm attracted to animals? Damn if I know... Little if anything, I suspect.

I have been attracted to animals as playmates since I was a young child. I remember being interested in animal genitalia (chiefly dogs) as early as age 10. My first realization that animals were something sexually stimulating occurred during my 12th year. I remember the incident very clearly. I was traveling with my family and we stopped to watch a horse show. A big bay mare pranced by and as I watched her she lifted her tail and I caught a glimpse of her pudendum. I remember feeling an immediate surge of what I can only call sexual arousal and it struck me very hard. From that point on I would fantasize about mares and only rarely about humans, though till that point I had zero sexual contact with horses and only limited contact of other sorts. I had always admired horses though. I remember sculpting mare's bottoms out of bubble bath as an early teenager, and then masturbating while rubbing my groin against the mounds of soap suds (weird, huh?). ... anyway, that's what led me to having sex with animals... mostly curiosity fueled by experimentation when possible.

My first genito-genital contact with a horse was at age 13 or so, with a pony mare who lived near my house. I was very nervous, but she was willing and we managed to get things done. I remember feeling horribly guilty, especially as I was aware of the Biblical prohibition against laying with animals (see Leviticus), and I had a strong religious upbringing. Fortunately I was able to deal with the societal brainwashing over time and found that I could indulge in my behavior without feeling overwhelming guilt. One of the reasons I think I don't have much to do with Judaism anymore is because I feel there is no place for me within the constraints of that belief system and if they don't want me then I have no use for them either. I still identify myself as fundamentally Jewish, but prefer to have as little contact with organized religion as possible...

When I was about 13 years old I used to visit a couple ponies who were stabled a few miles from my home. The first few times I tried to have sex with one she was pretty willing, but after awhile apparently grew tired of the experience and would walk away. Not being very experienced or in tune with the animals' feelings at that time in my life, I decided that I would try to loop a piece of twine around her rear ankles 'hobbling' her. She was quite resentful about it at first and tried to run around till she discovered she couldn't, then stood quietly. I proceeded to have sex with her but felt quite guilty afterwards. Nonetheless, this did not stop me from repeating the activity few more times. The mare was never hurt or really terribly inconvenienced, and she still could have put a stop to my advances if she really wanted to (there being no way for me to keep her from kicking out behind), but she instead chose to deal with it and let me get on with things.

I now realize that I have no need of such foolishness, and only restrain my mares now when working with them and the stallions simultaneously, and that's mostly so I don't get caught between them if they start to kick each other. I would not ever require an animal to have sex with me now, and my mares are not above giving me a good swat with a hoof if I get too fresh with them. I usually get the hint long before that happens. It is interesting to me that they will frequently allow me to interact sexually with them when they will absolutely tell off a stallion who tries the same tactics. I wonder if that's because they don't find my advances as threatening, or because they find them more enjoyable, even when not in estrus. For the record, two of my mares will permit sex at almost any time, one will allow it occasionally when not in estrus, but loves it when she is in heat, and two will only let me fool with them when in heat. The stallions are usually happy to play at the drop of a hat (ain't that males for you?).

I would also like to make a distinction between the acts of coercing an animal to do something and forcing it to do something. In my opinion it is virtually impossible to force an animal by physical means to do something that is totally against its will without becoming the unwilling recipient of some pretty amazing violence. However, it is possible to use ones willpower to dominate the animal or to use our human trickiness to compel the animal to do something it would not ordinarily do. One example that comes to mind is the use of food items to distract the animal long enough to accomplish sex with it. It is certainly possible to do so with

many animals, as their sense of greed usually takes over and they will let one do almost anything as long as they get to chew down on something nice. I personally find that practice distasteful and would much rather have the animals undivided attention. If one has to resort to trickery then the animal can't possibly be truly enjoying the experience. For me, the sexual act is far more rewarding when I know my partner is also having fun.

Horses have always been predominant in my fantasies but it wasn't until I got a job at a stable at age 14 that I began to have more than very occasional sexual contact with them. We had several stallions standing at the stable and it was there that I discovered my attraction to the males as well. Several of them quickly grew to enjoy and expect my attentions to them, though I hadn't the slightest idea of what I was doing, and I never actually got one to achieve orgasm until I was in my 20s. Part of this is that it's very very difficult to get a stallion to ejaculate unless things feel exactly right for him, and I didn't know how to simulate things well enough at that point. It's still a hit-or-miss process a lot of times, especially with new stallions. When it works, things can get kind of interesting.

I think that there would be both benefits and disadvantages to having a human partner. On the upside there's companionship, mutual support, romance and backrubs. On the downside there is emotional vulnerability, potential for disagreements, annoying personal habits and potential infidelity to worry about among other things. I think that life with a human mate/sexual partner as well as the animals could potentially be very rewarding. I think that it would also have the potential to drive one or both partners bonkers if things didn't work out.

I have been expending some energy trying to find a significant other but the challenge is daunting. I'm really not interested in dating anyone who is not also a zoophile, because I'd rather be with someone who understands my needs. The problem is that the number of zoophile women out there to pick from is rather small. Many are married or taken, and the others I've met have not had the kinds of qualities I am looking for in a mate (don't get me started on that topic, but I basically want someone who is rather like me... slender, intelligent, articulate, rather outgoing and totally and completely in love with animals). The search continues, however.

I do not believe that being a zoophile means that someone is any more (or less) messed up psychologically than any other person out there. I would however say that I think that it may be a contributing factor to problems in people who may already be a bit unstable. (Face it, it's not easy being singled out to be different!) And having to hide that side of things can cause lots of friction internally. I can only speak for myself, but I do not think that being a zoophile makes one whit of difference in a person's ability to be a stable, functional human being. It's just another challenge to deal with out of many challenges that people encounter. Some people cave in, some prevail and lead happy lives.

I would like to say that I am also quite happy to have the opportunity to be the person I am. I may not be 'normal' by most definitions, but I'm very happy with myself and where I am going in life for the most part."

His web-site "averaged a hit every three minutes on the opening page"

The zoos who were connected to the Internet around the time of my study, all knew Stasya (that's his Internet name). In his words — "One of the first things I did when getting Internet access was search the Internet for bestiality and zoo references. That was in December of 1994. A couple of times after finding ASB (alt.sex.bestiality news group), I responded privately to the messages there. I never did much more as I felt that even using the anon server wasn't private enough. Finally in May of 1995, I made arrangements for a second account with my provider. Also, there were enough people with them that I felt I could maintain the better part of my privacy. With that, I de-lurked in May of 1995. Those of you there at the time probably remember the sheer overwhelming volume for the next few weeks. *Smile* The dam had burst. I could actually be part of a family of people like me.

In September of 1995, I took the step of putting up a web page. Nervous about it? You bet. There was the media hysteria over porn on the net. I expected lots of abuse and problems along with the support of fellow zoos. What happened was totally outside what I expected. In less than a month, I had to remove the graphics and go strictly text. With the graphics in it, my single page was tying up 60% of a T-1. Average?

While I had the counter in it, it averaged a hit every three minutes on the opening page alone. I have no idea of the volume on the other parts. Only two people left my provider as a direct result of my page, as far as I know. Once we took it off the user home-page there hasn't seemed to be any more problems. I am deeply thankful I have a supportive provider. And that they believe in freedom of expression. So far as I know, the page now has stabilized at 10,000 or more accesses a month on the opening page. I receive anywhere from two to six messages per day from people saying 'thank you for being there.' This includes email from friends I have made on ASB and as a result of the page. The last abusive message I had was back on December 7, 1995. And, I've only had 14 of those total, vs. around 400 messages of support and 'thank you's.'

Stasya was the one who devoted a page for me and my study on his web-site. When he sent in his questionnaire, he also sent me two floppy disks with everything that was ever posted on his web-site and on the news group alt.sex.bestiality (ASB) to do with it as I pleased. The above excerpts were from an essay Stasya wrote and posted on alt.sex.bestiality on February 7, 1996, titled *Who is this Stasya person anyway?* On January 11, 1997, Stasya posted an essay titled *Stasya's Open Letter to Non-Zoophiles* on alt.sex.bestiality. In this essay, Stasya describes his life story. The following are excerpts from it —

"Hello neighbors. I'm Stasya. Yes, I'm one of those perverted animal fuckers you may have heard of. I'm not offended by that attitude on your part. You see, I'm so used to hearing that comment that it's boring. It tells me that you are probably closed-minded and intellectually lazy. Always taking the easy way out, you blindly parrot what the media and others tell you to say. Bluntly, you've never taken the time to ask one of us how *we* feel. How we view ourselves and our place in the world. Until now.

With the mutual insults out of the way, shall we sit down and see if we can bridge this gap between us? I'm willing to try if you are. I'll buy the dinner and drinks. Relax. You can leave any time and come back any time. I'll be here.

A couple of things I want you to know right away. Yes, I freely acknowledge that in the eyes of most of the world, I am a bestialist. An animal fucker. That to most of the world, it makes no difference if I call myself a zoophile or by the newer term zoosexual. To the world, there is no difference. I seek out and couple with animals for sexual relief and enjoyment. By definition, I'm a bestialist. Part of what I want to try and explain to you is that to me and many others like myself, there is a vast difference of meaning amongst these three terms.

My and other people's lifelong desire to seek our companionship, sexual release and love from animals as well as humans is the topic right now. I find it embarrassing at times that I have become, however unwillingly at first, a person who is viewed as a spokesman for the zoophile community. I'm not. I speak for myself and there are others who agree with things I say or do. I am no more 'typical' than anyone else. The only weight my discussions may have is based on my conversations, however brief, with several thousand fellow zoos. Of course, there is also my own experience as well.

Well, my first sexual exploration of animals that I recall was when I was entering puberty at about 14. Since I'm 43, that means I've been active for 29 years. There is a period from the age of around 18 to 22 that I had no sexual contact with animals. I'm canine exclusive. Dogs and bitches. Not all of the ones I've owned have gone on to become sexual partners. About half of them, four dogs and three bitches have become sexually active with me. I've had about 16 dogs total. Generally speaking, once we pair off sexually, we remain exclusive for the dog's life or until I stop because of their age. They've been willing to go on but in the interests of maintaining their health, I stop most forms of sexual contact that involve great amounts of physical activity. Also, there has been generally one dog and one bitch so we are actually a three person relationship. My current bitch has made it very clear that she doesn't want me sexually active with other females.

As for humans... Well, should I find myself in a relationship, I'll deal with that when it happens. The woman will have to be accepted by my dogs as well as me, as I don't spend a lot of time around people who can't tolerate animals.

[OK, you've fucked animals. Dogs. Why can't you go out and find a woman? Hell, can't you go find a prostitute?] <pause for thought...> This is something that even now, is painful for me to discuss. Listen to yourself for a moment. Do you realize how *insensitive* that sounds? You're asking me to go *use* a woman rather than seek her company for companionship and love. I know you mean well and that you have a genuine

puzzlement about why I don't have a woman or man in my life. We're now discussing something that points up our different world views. Actually, I am quite social in non-sexual ways. I do enjoy the company of women and men. I've had a few sexual relationships with women. I'm not blind to them. I haven't excluded women and the possibility of sex with them. I've also recently admitted to myself that I could enjoy a gay relationship if the conditions were right. Primarily, I want a full relationship with a woman someday.

Still, I have my dogs. They are not something I screw as some sort of second best activity. Until recently, I looked at my activities with them in that light. Wonderful, fantastic. But, still something I could walk away from if I met the 'right' woman. I know better now. For various reasons, my formative years were spent learning to fear women. I absorbed the ideas that they were manipulative and not to be trusted. That they always used men or acted loving but always did so when they wanted to use men for some reason of their own. That if I did form a relationship and something went wrong, I would lose everything I had worked for. Remember, I grew up during the 50s and early 60s. If a marriage went bad, it was *always* the man's fault in the eyes of the law. My own father abused my mother and she divorced him when I was around 6. I still remember the hell of divorce court. Looking through that wooden barrier in the courtroom. If I was an artist, I could render that scene down to the grain of the wood. Thirty- seven years ago and the memories are that vivid even now.

Not her fault, but my mother transferred her dislike of men to me as she raised me. I was near 20 before I even realized what had happened. That fear drove me to animals for companionship. Eventually, it became sexual in nature. Puberty and the hormone driven lust involved ensured my interest in anything sexual. Over the years, I developed a sexual relationship with our male dog. I screwed him in the ass and he would lay there as I straddled him and masturbated to orgasm. We had an emotional bond but I never thought of it as love. We mostly used each other to satisfy our needs. I never thought of what we shared as love. You can't love animals after all. Then, there was another male dog we owned. Sex with him became routine. I never had either of these mount me. I've only screwed one dog anally. My first one.

Age 18. I leave home. No dogs. A time in the Army. A failed situation when a woman wanted sex and I just couldn't develop interest in her. No attraction for her. She just wasn't someone I could feel enough for to get sexually involved. No interest in men. Lots of masturbation for relief. 1976. December. I decide to get a dog again. I decide that I want to get a bitch and use her for sex. Yep. Pure bestialist. I'm afraid of women. No hope of forming a relationship with one. Hell, I don't have a clue how to start.

Dogs I know. Dogs, I have a bond with. I understand dogs. I get a bitch. I'm going to fuck her no matter what. I did have some vague idea and waited until she was in heat. Our male got to her first. Soon after, I fucked her while in bed. She never objected. Awesome experience. Real fucking finally. Vaginal sex. I was hooked. Love? Never occurred to me. Several years go by. I fucked her damn near every day. Many times more than once.

Finally, after several years, it hit me. We weren't fucking. We were making love to each other. We'd kiss deeply whenever the mood hit us. We'd cuddle and share quiet moments. In short, we shared everything that I'd always been taught was what I could expect if I fell in love with a woman. The only difference was that *my* lover was a bitch. Everything was there, only the package it came in was different.

That bitch trained me too well. I have to have something there emotionally before I can develop sexual interest in someone. I have to feel that my partner returns my feelings before sex will happen. And, sadly, because I'm used to the openness of animals, I'm extremely sensitive to body language. Word games don't work. If the words and actions don't agree, there's no interest on my part. If a woman plays games or her body language tells me she only wants to use me, I have no interest."

And let's end Stasya's story with one of his poems. This one, *My Love*, was posted on alt.sex.bestiality on August 22, 1996 —

“Eyes.
Soft and brown.
Filled with
Love
And trust.

Understading Bestiality and Zoophilia

 You
Are not the first one.
But now,
For as long as you are with me
You are first.
 We both know this.
Beyond words,
We understand.
 Your feet
Spurn the ground.
Your body
Speaks of power.
 When you walk
You flow with a smoothness
That denies
Your size.
 When you run
There is beauty.
You are alive.
 Ahh...
Those quiet times.
When we are together.
Sharing.
 As I
Lay with you.
As I caress you.
 And you
In your way,
Caress me
 Each touch
Is pleasure.
Each movement
Reveals the inner part.
 Of us.
When,
At last we couple.
It is not just
Sexual union.
 It is
A quiet affirmation
Of our love
And desire
For the other.
 It doesn't matter
That I
Am a man
And you
Are a bitch.
 What matters
Is that
We have
Each other.
 We are
We trust
We love.”

“I have slit open the bellies of puppies and used the hole for a place to fuck”

I promised to elaborate about participant AI=35’s case, and now is the time. Let’s call him “Isaac.” Isaac was a 35 year old, married man, with no children. He did not finish highschool, worked as a mechanic, and earned between \$40,001 and \$50,000 a year. He was raised by both his parents, and reported having two close friends whom he met or talked to daily. Isaac rated himself as a “4” on the sociability scale (1 to 5). He did not grow up on a farm, but had cats and dogs as a child. At the time of the study, he did not live on a farm either, but had four dogs.

Isaac reported that at the age of seven, an older boy forced him to give oral sex to a dog. That was his first sexual encounter with an animal, and he did not like the experience. Isaac further related that “my folks were not there for me. I had no where to turn. My father would degrade me and call me names in front of peers.” Isaac tried to commit suicide while in the Navy because “I was alone and rejected by shipmates.” He saw one psychotherapist who “was a behaviorist. He wanted me to wear a rubber band and snap myself when I thought of sex with animals.” In the year prior to the study, Isaac reported he was “generally satisfied, pleased” with his personal life.

Before the age of puberty, Isaac was sexually molested by two men, family friends. They fondled his genitals, performed anal sex on him, and forced him to perform oral sex on them. He also had sexual contacts with his niece, when he was 13 years old, and with his nephew, when he was 14. Unfortunately, the questionnaire did not provide the niece and nephew’s ages.

Isaac began masturbating at age 12. His first sexual intercourse occurred when he was 16, with a friend. Since then, he had eight different women sex partners, but in the year prior to the study, he did not have sex with any woman. His first homosexual sexual encounter was one of his abuse incidents. He was seven years old, and was forced to perform oral sex on an older boy who lived down the street. Since then, Isaac had 12 men sexual partners (including the two abusers), and in the year prior to the study, he had sex with a man once. He rated himself as a “4=both homosexual and heterosexual, but more homosexual” on the Kinsey scale. At the time of the study, Isaac reported he masturbated about 10 times per week.

When asked what did he like to fantasize about when engaging in a sexual behavior, Isaac reported: “Having sex with a human being of the opposite gender,” “Watching two women have sex,” “Watching two men have sex,” “Raping a human being,” and “Killing animals!” His favorite sexual behaviors that he reported engaging in were: “Performing oral sex on a human male,” “Sex with children,” “Sex with animals,” “using bestiality-related pornography,” and “Watching a live animals sex show.” His sexual philosophy — “Do what feels good.”

Since his first sexual encounter/abuse with an animal, at age seven, Isaac had “sexual relations” with about 100 different animals. In the year prior to the study, he had daily sexual contact with animals, altogether with about 18 different animals. Isaac reported he first realized he was sexually attracted to animals when he was 14 years old. He realized he was also psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals when he was 30. He rated himself as a “5=only incidental human sex” on the Kinsey-like scale of sexual orientation to animals vs. humans.

When engaging in sexual contact with female animals, Isaac reported he always “masturbated the animal,” had “vaginal-penile intercourse” with it, and performed cunnilingus on the animal. When engaging in sexual contact with male animals, Isaac reported he primarily “masturbated the animal,” and performed fellatio on the animal. He then added: “I have raped female and male pups. I have slit open the bellies and used the hole for a place to fuck!”

Isaac reported he had sexual contact with dogs, cats, horses, sheep, goats, chickens, and rabbits. He further reported that he began having sex with animals because he “had no human partners available,” he “was too shy to have sex with humans,” he was lonely, he felt he “could only trust animals,” he “was forced into it,” and if he did to a human being what he did to the animal he “would have gotten arrested.” Isaac also reported that having fantasies about sex with animals contributed to his first sexual encounter with an animal. Isaac related that he continued to have sex with animals because he wanted “to express love or affection to the animal,” he was “sexually attracted to the animal,” and because “the animals want it.” He further related that it was “mostly true” that he continued to have sex with animals also because he was “too shy to have sex with

humans,” he felt he could only trust animals, and if he did to a human being what he did to the animal he “would be arrested!”

When asked if he ever forced an animal to have sexual relations with him, Isaac replied: “I have picked up give-away dogs and raped them and killed them!” When asked if an animal ever needed medical care as a result of having sexual relations with him, he replied: “I have left many dogs injured as a result of raping them!” Isaac defined himself as “both bestialist and zoophile” and explained: “I love my own lover very much, but I can still go and flat out rape dogs. I would never think of hurting my own dogs.” When asked what he thought the animals felt about having sex with him, Isaac related: “My own lovers love it. The dogs and critters I rape don’t!”

Isaac reported he did not want to stop having sex with animals. He related: “I like making love and fucking dogs and critters.” He came out to his brother and his wife. His wife’s reaction: “She tells me to keep it to myself. She and I no longer have sex with each other.”

Obviously, Isaac’s “sexual behaviors” with animals are very disturbing and greatly unexpected. My attempts to be objective and to ask questions that may reveal negative characteristics in some of the subjects appeared to have been successful. A face-to-face interview may have assisted in understanding the complexity of Isaac’s behaviors. Moreover, it seems that there is a need for more studies about the phenomenon of mutilation of animals.

As mentioned before, some authors believe that cruelty to animals may stem from anger toward human figures toward whom such behavior could not be exhibited (Menninger, 1951). The animal not only serves as a substitute for a human object, but “it is also abused for the re-enactment of traumatic experiences under pressure of the principle of repetition compulsion. The animal then becomes an outlet for sadistic-murderous impulses” (Rappaport, 1968, pp. 583-584).

I have no doubt that many readers will point a finger at this participant, and say — “Ah ha, we knew it all along; all people who have sex with animals are mentally disturbed and sexually abuse the animals.” However, it is important to keep the numbers in perspective; in a study of 93 people, it is not surprising to find one participant (1.08%) who acts out in inappropriate manners and differs from the other participants. It may be my bias, but I do not believe this participant’s behaviors and attitudes should, nor can reflect what the zoos as a group do and think.

I debated whether I should talk about Isaac at all. It was even suggested that I eliminate him from the study altogether. But I decided to go ahead and discuss his case since, after all, he was a participant in the study, and it didn’t seem fair to eliminate him because I didn’t like his answers.

(After the first printing of this book, “Isaac” contacted me. He related that he had sought therapy, and maintained he no longer engages in abusive behaviors).

“I lost my virginity that day”

“Barbara” was a 37-year-old woman, divorced with two children. A Dental hygienist, she earned between \$50,001 and \$100,000 a year. Raised by both her parents and, although brought up Catholic, she no longer attended religious services. She had four close friends whom she saw or talked to daily. Barbara rated herself as “very out-going, loves to be around people...,” and reported she was never abused in any way. Barbara did not grow up on a farm, but had a dog with which she was not sexually active since it seemed incestual to her.

Her first sexual intercourse with a man occurred when she was 25, after their engagement. At the time of the study, Barbara had heterosexual sexual relations about three times a week. She never had sexual relations with women. Barbara’s sexual philosophy: “As long as the acts are consensual, and the decision is made by those capable of doing so, they are acceptable. My sexuality is a gift from God.”

Her first animal sexual encounter was at the age of 13, with her best friend’s male dog. It happened in her friend’s bathroom. She reported: “We kissed, licked each other, and then I got on the floor and encouraged him to mount me. I lost my virginity that day.” Since then, Barbara had sexual relations with about 35 animals,

30 of them were male dogs. At the time of the study, she had sexual relations with animals two to three times per week.

Barbara reported she began having sex with animals because “of curiosity” and because she “was sexually attracted to the animal.” She continued to have sex with animals because she was “sexually attracted to the animal.” When asked if she would allow other people to have sex with her animals, Barbara replied: “Would be the same as sharing my husband — no way!”

Three friends and her ex-husband knew about her bestiality. She said: “They loved me before, they love me still. Lucky me! :)” Barbara further described that her husband’s reaction was “Disbelief! It took me about 10 years of periodic references to make him believe me. I finally had to show him what was stored in my computer to make him believe. I think he was relieved that the ‘other’ in my life wasn’t another man.”

When asked if she would like to stop having sex with animals, Barbara replied: “I enjoy it, they enjoy it — it hurts no one. Why stop?” At the end of the questionnaire, Barbara added the following: “I have always been curious about what makes us zoophiles, and frankly, even after about 30 years of being one, I have no clue. My earliest memories of love-play with animals started when I was about six or seven years of age, culminating in intercourse at the age of 13. It seemed to me when growing up that I was going through parallel, and concurrent puberties, neither of which having anything to do with the other. I matured sexually earlier with animals... a 12 year gap between my first intercourse with a dog and first intercourse with a man. I was raised to believe that “nice girls” didn’t, and if they did, they would be forever scorned. No one told me not to have sex with animals. :) I never had any guilt. I did worry somewhat about being caught, but no more than if I would have been petting with a boyfriend.”

“I can understand dogs better than humans”

“Gustav” was a Swedish, single man, who lived with a roommate. Only 20-years-old, and already a college graduate, and a librarian in his profession. He was raised by both his parents, and reported having 10 close friends. He rated himself as a “3=sometimes likes to be with people, has several friends” on the sociability scale. Gustav did not grow up on a farm, nor did he have any pets or animals as a child. At the time of the study, he did not live on a farm, and he had no animals. His first association with animals was through visiting his neighbor’s farm — “neighbors of mine had horses and cows, unfortunately no dogs (my preferred species).” Gustav reported he was never abused in any way, nor was he in psychotherapy. However, twice he tried to commit suicide — “Feeling I was the only one in the world who felt like I do for animals.” At the time of the study, Gustav reported he was “very happy most of the time.”

Gustav never had any sexual relations with humans. He masturbated about twice a day, and his only sexual fantasy was about sex with animals. His sexual philosophy — “As long as all involved agree with the act, and no one gets hurt, sex is not wrong. Personally, I want to have a stable and close relationship with someone (animal) before I have sexual relations with them. Basically, I do not believe in sex without love. Not for myself. If others wants to do it, it is okay by me.”

His first sexual experience occurred when Gustav was 16 years old, with a cow he had used to spend time with every day for nine months. It happened “out in the field, in the middle of the day. I had wanted to try it for very long, and here I was with a cow who I knew well... I used my hands and my mouth to satisfy her vagina and anus. I liked it a lot. She liked it, because she didn’t back away, and she was still my friend after this.” Gustav since had sex with a mare and a bitch as well, yet he noted that “canines are the species of my absolute preference. I consider myself primarily a ‘dogzoo,’ and mostly female dogs.” When Gustav had sex with animals he masturbated the animals and performed cunnilingus on them. In the year prior to the study, he had sex with two different animals, altogether eight times.

Gustav related that he began having and continued to have sex with animals because “of identification with the animal of my gender,” “I wanted to express love or affection to the animal,” “I was sexually attracted to the animal,” and “the animal wanted it.” He told 12 people: friends, his brother, workmates, and his former boss. “All of my friends accepted it. Two of them were somewhat startled at first. My former boss accepts it and is very interested in it himself. My brother and one workmate think it is sick and disgusting. They don’t accept it.”

When asked if he would like to stop having sex with animals, Gustav replied: "Definitely not. There's nothing wrong in being a zoophile. I love dogs so much, I'm glad that I am a zoophile and I wouldn't want to be something else." When asked how having sex with animals influenced his life-style, he said: "I think I am generally more accepting and tolerating towards other people. Plus that I get very angry and saddened when seeing people treating animals in a bad way." I then asked how he thought his life would have been different if he had a close intimate/sexual relationship with a human being. Gustav replied: "No idea. I don't want to do it. I am zoo exclusive and the very thought of having sex with a human disgusts me. Ask a homosexual if he wants to have sex with someone of the opposite gender."

Although Gustav reported having no animals/pets, he related the following: "My partner, a German Shepherd/Labrador bitch, does not want to copulate, not even with other dogs. She tells me. It is just as easy to understand a dog as a human. She loves it when I perform oral sex with her though. How do I know? She tells me. She comes back for more, she doesn't want me to stop. I would love to copulate with her though, but it is her decision and I am not going to push her in that matter."

At the end of the questionnaire, Gustav added the following: "I am not attracted to humans at all. Dogs mean so much to me. I think they are the most beautiful creatures on this planet, and I regard them as higher than humans. Even though I like humans and all other animals also. Note that I am not degrading humanity. I am just thinking very highly of dogs. I can identify with dogs a lot more than I can identify with humans. I am thinking a lot like dogs, and therefore I can understand dogs better than humans."

"The only unnatural sex act is one that cannot be performed!"

"Alan" saw the ad about the study in the *Baltimore City Paper*. A 69 year old African-American, married man with three children, he was a retired college professor with a doctoral degree in Theology. Alan seemed like a very unusual man in his view points about sexuality, as revealed by his sexual philosophy — "The only unnatural sex act is one that cannot be performed!" Along with his questionnaire, he sent me a letter:

"I hope that my answers to your questions don't throw your expectations and predictions so far out of kilter that you can not use them, but all I could do was give you a clear and true picture of my experience with animal sex, and if this was not the sort of thing that you were looking for, I am sorry.

I and my six siblings (6 boys, 1 girl) happen to have been raised sexually free. That is to say, we were never reprimanded, prohibited, forbidden, punished in any way for asking sexual questions, engaging in sex play among ourselves, or with our peers. I had three older brothers who were extremely handsome, extremely horny, and very popular with the girls. Since we lived a couple of miles outside of town on a small farm, all the 'town kids' hung out at our place, and there was some sort of sex going on at just about any hour in the day.

I was a precocious child, and was reading books before I entered the first grade. My brothers collected pornography. Anything I didn't understand they explained to me. I was an easy-to-get-along with child, who could not say 'no,' and when our neighbor boy of 10-12 asked me at about age four to 'suck him off,' as always, I said 'okay.' When I would wake up with one of my older brothers (8 or 10) pumping away with his penis in my rectum, I knew he wasn't supposed to be 'doing that,' but it didn't hurt at all, so why not? I found everything that had to do with sex absolutely fascinating. I would watch my older brothers in the hay loft, and other places around the farm having sex with their little girlfriends, I'd put my ear to the wall, and listen to my parents have sex in the next room at night, and I'd masturbate two or three times a day.

When the neighbor boy whom I was fellating a couple of times a week started having sex with my dog, I thought that was real neat, and tried it myself. When I saw the big boys screwing horses, cows, sows, sheep, even chickens, I would try it the very first chance I got. And that's the way I grew from earliest childhood. Sex was better and more fun than anything I could think of, and I was still years away from actual girl/boy intercourse.

What my brother was doing to me in bed at night, I discovered he was also doing to our little sister when she reached 4-5 years old. By then I was 9-10 and I thought that was neat, too, so I began 'practicing' on her (anally only).

My parents were fabulously loving, intelligent, supportive and nurturing people. In spite of the fact that my father was an insatiable womanizer, there was never a cross word between them. I idolized my father, and all I wanted out of life was to be ‘just like my daddy!’ Daddy told me at a very young age that I could do anything under the sun that I really wanted to do. All I had to do was set myself some goals and work towards them, and nobody in the world could stop me — except me, myself. So at about the age of 13 I sat down and wrote a list of goals that I would accomplish before I died. I had just had intercourse to orgasm with my first real, live, consenting woman (she was 28!), and I knew then and there that I would never get enough sex if I lived to be 100! I had also just read Don Juan (or was it Casanova) who was supposed to have made love to 1,000 women. So the very first goal on my list was to have sex with at least 1,000 women. I have long since tripled, if not quadrupled that number.

The second goal on my list was to get a Ph.D. I got my Ph.D. in Literature, and still wanting to be just like my daddy, who was a Baptist preacher, I went on and got myself a Doctorate in Theology. But by then, being an Atheist, I couldn’t preach in a traditional church, so I am now in the process of starting my own Community/Human Development oriented church.

My next book will be *The Other Side of Incest*, which will show that incest need not be the brutal, traumatic scene of fathers molesting their pre-school and grammar school daughters. And finally I plan to do: **EVERYTHING YOU HAVE EVER BEEN TAUGHT ABOUT SEX IS WRONG!** That should keep me busy for the next decade or so.”

Alan further related in the questionnaire that: “I have never been really attracted to animals sexually. I had sex with them for fun. I loved sex and had not gotten around to real, live of age girls.” Obviously, Alan fits the definition of “bestialist,” not “zoo.”

“Sex is merely an expression of love”

“Judy,” a 33-year-old divorced woman, raised by both her parents and, although brought up Protestant, no longer attended religious services. She was an attorney, and reported having five close friends whom she met or talked to “daily in some cases, weekly in others — depends on what is occurring in both sets of lives.” Judy reported she was never abused in any way, but then proceeded to relate that a male stranger fondled her genitals before puberty. She further reported that she was never in psychotherapy. She did not grow up on a farm, yet she had dogs, cats, and hamsters as a child. At the time of the study, Judy owned dogs, but did not live on a farm.

Judy’s first sexual intercourse occurred when she was 19 years old, with her then boyfriend. Overall, she had six men sexual partners, and in the last year she had sex five times with one man. Her first sexual encounter with a woman occurred at 19 as well, with a girlfriend. Overall, Judy reported she had six women sexual partners, and in the last year she had sex about twice a month with one woman. She also masturbated about once a week. Her sexual philosophy — “If it harms no one and is safe and consensual, do what feels good.”

Her first sexual encounter with an animal occurred when she was nine years old. It was the family female dog, at home. Judy described: “The female dog walked into the bathroom as I was getting out of the bathtub. She moved directly to me and began licking my genitals. It felt good and her tail was wagging. We just continued.” When asked what made her do it, she replied — “Nothing made me — I had always felt attracted to animals. It was so natural and occurred at such a young age that I never questioned it. I loved them. I knew they loved me. They wanted to do it — it felt good. There never seemed to be an issue for me.” Judy further reported that she began having sex with animals because she both “wanted to express love or affection to the animal” and “was sexually attracted to the animal.”

Judy continued to have sex with animals because she wanted “to express love or affection to the animal,” she was “sexually attracted to the animal,” and because “the animal(s) want(ed) it.” Overall, Judy had sexual relations with six different animals, and in the year prior to the study, she had sex about once a week with two different animals. Only one person knew she was a zoo. It was a woman who used to be her lover, and at the time of the study they were “best friends.” She described: “It was more of a mutual sharing of

attractions — she and I admitted to one another that we were both zoophiles. We were both happy to be able to share, and still are.” Judy’s ex-husband never knew.

She defined herself as a “zoophile,” and explained: “my relationships with animals are about love and trust — sex is merely an expression of that love. It is consensual and pleasurable for both parties, and either party can decline with appropriate body language. Even if sex were no longer possible with them, I would still love and adore them just as much.” When asked if she would like to stop having sex with animals, she replied: “Why would I want to? Sex is a pleasurable experience that we share, that deepens our relationship. I can stop — I choose not to.” Judy further related: “I will only consider another zoophile for a live-in relationship because I want to share all of me with a true mate.”

At the end of her questionnaire, she added the following: “I wrote my first (innocuous and innocent as it was) zoo story when I was 7 — the girl married her dog in the end. Long before I understood sex, sexuality, morality, or zoophilia, I understood that I had a deep love for animals, a bond that was undeniable — especially for dogs. I don’t believe I ‘chose’ this lifestyle. It is just a part of who and what I am — one part of many. It is natural, consensual, satisfying, and overwhelmingly loving. My dogs are happy — I am happy. My relationships with my dogs add a dimension to my life that would be an aching void without them — they do not, however, replace my relationships (sexual or otherwise) with human beings. My dogs do not understand holidays, movies, books, or the other hobbies I share with human partners and friends. They do not understand music or candlelight or flowers. However, they are never away from me. They comfort me. We play games and enjoy sunny days. We love car rides with the windows down, take long walks, and just snuggle happily and contentedly against one another. The relationships (human and zoophile) are complementary. Both add important dimensions to my life and allow me to care/love in return in different ways. Neither my relationships with humans or animals depends on sex, but both can be enhanced by it. Sex is merely an expression of love — and that’s the bottom line. I love them.”

His favorite sexual fantasy involved “having sex with animals”

“David” was a 41-year-old man. Although never married, he had two children from two different women. He never completed college, and at the time of the study was unemployed. David’s father died when he was seven years old, and his mother soon remarried. He was raised Christian, but as an adult practiced “a mix of pagan (Wicca/Shaman).” David reported he had about 16 close friends whom he met or talked to from “nearly every day” to “at least three times per year” depending on where these friends resided. At the time of the study, he was not connected to the Internet.

While growing up, David recalled his mother telling him “that I would never amount to a hill of beans and other comments of that nature.” He added: “I often felt as if I were a disappointment developmentally; was teased by other children and bullies.” David saw one therapist throughout his life, and told him about his sexual relations with animals. The therapist suggested “I should try to expand my social activities and perhaps move to a larger city.”

David did not grow up on a farm, but he had cats and dogs as a child. At the time of the study, he did not live on a farm, and did not own any pets/animals. His first sexual intercourse, he reported, occurred at the age of four, with a neighbor friend, who was a few years older. Overall, he had 10 heterosexual sexual partners. His first homosexual sexual contact occurred when he was about eight years old, with his nephew. Overall, he had three homosexual sexual partners, although he defined himself as “exclusively heterosexual.” During the year prior to the study, David did not have any sexual contact with humans. He masturbated about four times per week, and his favorite sexual fantasy involved “having sex with animals.” He added: “fantasizing most often that I am the male animal mating with female animal or human female. Almost exclusively use pictures of mating animals for lack of adequate erotica.”

As David said, his sexuality seems to have “matured” only recently. He reported that he had sex with children who were at least five years younger than he was at the time, and that he felt “okay” about it. David also admitted to raping another human being, and noted that “Truthfully, I enjoyed it very much, but I was much younger and (now I) feel that rape is not conducive to good sex. I rate this question as ‘did not like it’ because the victim was harmed.” He then described his sexual philosophy — “One of tenderness, caring and

sharing with humans or animals (females). I believe sex is an aspect of love and would hope my partner both receives my love and returns it. My experiences may be biased toward animals, but I expect my partner to return my love and companionship, without reservation or hidden motive, as I try to give. I admit to anthropomorphizing animals, but I have a feeling that ethics and morality are where I have no adequate rebuttal. A pity.”

David’s first sexual encounter with an animal occurred when he was 17 years old. His sex partner was a mare, inside a barn, at night. He described: “I brought her in and put her in a stall with some hay to eat. I positioned a bale of hay behind her to stand on. I tried to penetrate her but could not, until I used two more bales to keep her still; one to each side of her rear legs. Then I could. At first she didn’t like it because she kept shifting her hind quarters left or right. I surmise because she was not in heat.” Since then, David had about 32 different animal sex partners, and his most common sexual behavior with them was to masturbate the animals. In the year prior to the study, David had sex with two different animals. He related: “On average, I had contact with dogs once every three months.” David rated himself as a “5=only incidental human sex” on the human/animal Kinsey-like scale.

David reported he began having sex with animals because he “wanted to experience something else.” He continued to have sex with animals because he both wanted “to express love or affection to the animal,” and he was “sexually attracted to the animal.” When asked what did he think the animals felt about having sex with him, David replied: “I think that most feel I am a sex machine because I am nearly always ‘courting’ them. With spayed and neutered dogs they have very little sex drive and only the clitoris of the bitch gives them any pleasure — even then it’s brief. I know it because when I solicit them with courtship behavior they respond. Complete with pelvic thrusts and ‘talk.’” At some point, David tried to “gently request” that one of his girlfriends have sex with her male dog. She declined “and never seemed to make the connection. I never told her I was a zoophile until after our breakup.”

When asked if he would have liked to stop having sex with animals, David replied: “In a nut shell, I have honed my sensitivity to the feelings and emotions of animals in an effort to better understand and bond with them. That makes me a bit over-sensitive to the convoluted ‘mind games’ of so called normal social relations.” When asked how having sex with animals influenced his life style, David provided an unusual response: “Only to where I contained the negative feelings and associations enough to cause much bitter feelings over lost productivity and happiness. The trouble is I did this to myself because I so desperately wanted to be a selfish, greedy and careless human like most people I have known.” Another revealing answer given to the question “how would your life be different if you had a close intimate/sexual relationship with a human being?” — “I would probably have finished my first try at college, and become an automotive or diesel mechanic. Failing that I would have gone from one job to another, to jail, until I later found a niche to fit into or died in the attempt. Hard to say.”

Indeed, David sounds dissatisfied. Yet, when asked how happy he had been during the year prior to the study, he replied: “Generally satisfied, pleased. I would be much happier to have the situation (housing and income) necessary to purchase and properly care for a miniature horse or donkey and a dog.” His health was “good” he reported, adding that his health was good considering a disability due to a work accident about 20 years ago, which left him limping on one leg and suffering pain.

At the end of the questionnaire, David wrote the following: “Each animal is an individual personality and as such has different responses to sexual stimulus. This means that probably many animals are suffering at the hands of people who do not care about the feelings of our fellow creatures. This is unfortunate because domestic animals are worthy of more consideration than many people give them. I am not saying they are mentally equal to humans, but because animals are ours to care for they deserve the very same treasures they give to us humans. Love, trust, faithfulness and honesty. That is the most important reason I choose an animal lover over a human one... because an animal is ‘for real’ when they say ‘I love you.’ Lastly I have encountered a few animals who are not into sex at all and believe me, I am not about to argue with fangs or hooves!

I am most grateful to be able to ‘lance the festering boil of my soul’ as I don’t want/wish non ‘animal lovers’ to persecute others like me out of fear, hatred, disgust and misunderstanding. Prosecuting ‘bestialists/zoophilies/animal lovers’ for real crimes such as trespassing, real cruelty, or any other crime is to be expected. But to punish a person for finding the love to sustain him/her in our rough world is wrong. It is my

prayer that this study will find real value among the people of this sub-culture. If not, perhaps it will show some interesting data anyway.

I would like to state for the record that my sexuality didn't become fully mature until a short time ago, since I always had it stuffed into the 'closet' where it could not grow. Anyway, some of my past behaviors, trespassing, technical rape, and cruelty, are not part of my makeup anymore. My interests and goals in life are primarily towards recovering from thirty years of malaise and trying to find a situation where I can pursue that recovery without danger to me. I have no animosity toward society and I feel that I am a useful part, even if I am to be a bad example."

"I was a farm kid"

"Peter" was a 63-year-old College Professor, married with two grown children. Raised by both his parents, he related that "As I look back, I had a near perfect family. Never saw my parents fight — only once argue. I was loved, wanted, appreciated. I was encouraged to do well and motivated to set high goals." He was never abused in any way, had many friends, and rated himself as a "1=very out going, loves to be around people, has many friends" on the sociability scale.

His first sexual intercourse occurred when he was 25 years old. He since had five women partners, and during the year prior to the study he only had sexual relations with his wife, about once a week. He never had homosexual sexual relations. Peter's sexual philosophy — "Enjoy, give pleasure, receive pleasure and be responsible!!! Be sure I don't do anything that would displease my partner or harm or upset my partner."

Peter reported: "I was a farm kid. We had cows, horses, pigs, sheep and chickens. I can't recall (before age 4) when I began helping feed and care for animals on our farm." Peter heard his friends talk about sex with animals on the school bus. He also caught three of his friends having sex with a sheep, a mare, and a chicken, on three separate occasions. Peter's first sexual experience with an animal occurred when he was 14 years old, with a heifer. Peter related: "I stood on a bucket so I could reach her vulva, unzipped my pants and proceeded to insert my penis. I thrust back and forth until I ejaculated. It felt good (better than masturbating) because of the warm, moisten vulva, but I did feel guilty. But, it felt so good, I did it the next day, and the next. The guilt feeling vanished. I could see no harm from my actions. It felt so good it seemed okay." Peter continued to have sex with the heifer for four months, and never had sexual relations with an animal ever again.

In a note attached to the questionnaire, Peter related the following: "I may be a 'disappointment' for your study. My contact was long ago and probably not what you seem to be looking for — someone attracted to animals as opposed to someone who had a more casual contact." Indeed, Peter does not seem to be a "zoo," but a "bestialist," who fits the profile of Kinsey's subjects. When asked if he ever forced an animal to have sexual relations with him, Peter responded — "Yes, because my heifer didn't initiate these contacts, I guess one could say I forced her into it. But, she was trained by me to follow my commands; to walk, stand, parade, etc. She didn't seem to enjoy my penis in her vagina, and didn't seem to object."

He never told anyone about his experience with the heifer. Peter added: "My wife would freak out if she knew this. She would probably 'cut me off' if she knew about my adventure with my heifer 15 years before we met."

"Sexual relations with a 1700 lb. bull?"

At the time of the study, "U.G." was 50 years old, an author and a married man. Raised by both parents, he had dogs, although he did not live on a farm. U.G. was married to his second wife, and related that both his wives knew about his sexual relations with animals before they got married. He was not an "active zoo" during his first marriage, however. The second wife, he reported, knew and accepted him the way he was. He had heterosexual sexual relations with only the two of them, the first time when he was 21. In the year prior to the study, he only had sex with his wife (about every other week) and with his animals (about three times a week).

U.G. sent me pictures of his lovers, a bull and a cute pony. He also sent an attachment to the questionnaire in which he elaborated on most questions. I would like to share some of it with you, so that you can read U.G.'s story in his own words —

“I do not consider myself shy though I am quite uncomfortable in crowds. My contact with people is partly limited by a desire for solitude and partly by a paucity of people with whom I am compatible. I do not care to be ‘friends’ with people who don’t know I am a zoo, and there aren’t many with whom I will trust that fact. By nature I am not particularly chatty or sociable. I have zero interest in the personal details of other people’s lives. I only enjoy being with people with whom I can have frank, intense discussions about the things that interest me which are mostly science, music, art, human and animal sexual behavior (in the abstract), and landscape gardening. This rather limits me to my wife and the 4 close friends that I made during my teenage years. None of these are zoos...

I do not communicate over the net with other zoos. I do not even log on to ‘zoo’ sites. I did for a short while. Stasya was kind enough to post some of my writings, and my ‘How to guide for mini stallions’ was posted as one of the FAQs for ASB (alt.sex.bestiality). Unfortunately, besides meeting electronically some potential friends, I also encountered a number of people who made consistent attempts to find out who I am in real life. So I removed myself from cyber space. I suppose that I am basically a coward. The state in which I live has a mandatory 10 year prison sentence for making love to an animal. I do not wish to spend time in jail or be beat-up and run out of town, a very real possibility, gentle reader. The people who wrote this law can kill and eat animals freely. But I am not allowed to love them. Thus I do not, in general, have good feelings about my fellow countrymen.

I live on sort of a farm. (But), none of my activities with the land constitute farming, (and) none of my own animals are kept for commercial purposes.

My first therapist (the one at Child Guidance) was sincerely sympathetic, but he just didn’t get it. Could not believe what I was telling him about the kinds of things that animals did with me; that these acts were real and shared. My second therapist ‘helped’ me to decide that I could be straight. This led to my first marriage, which was a disaster. It lasted a little less than one year.

I have very little homosexual impulse towards men. After the failure of my first marriage, (when, with the ‘help’ of a therapist, I tried to deny my zoophilia) I attempted homosexual relations with two gay friends but found the experiences sexually unappealing. The smell was all wrong at the least. On the other hand my sexual desire for animals is almost exclusively homosexual.

After my first marriage I again embraced my zoophilia completely and felt much the better for it. I also have found ‘true love’ in my second marriage which has lasted more than 20 years and is still going strong. I have also found true love with a horse. Such a relationship is best started when the horse is young and (you) take a great deal of time alone with your own horse. And being somewhat lucky in getting a horse with the right propensities. The physical problems of size are overcome by getting a mini (horse).

I began masturbating while I was in the 4th grade. I must have been about 10. I came up with my sexual fantasies with absolutely no prior knowledge of sexual acts other than having on a few occasions watched dogs copulating. When I began having zoophilic fantasies, fellatio of stallions was my favorite. My sexual drive grew stronger over the next couple of years as well as sadistic fantasies involving men, sometimes women, but never animals.

At about age 13, I tortured a frog. I was appalled and profoundly ashamed of myself for this and vowed never to do such again. But a week or so later, I did it again. This left me terrified and completely devastated at my inability to control my acts. I was racked with fear that I might do the same things to people. And so I turned into myself and looked within as deeply as I could, and thought about morality and goodness and evil, with all the effort and ability and understanding that a 13-year-old child could master. And I found that my passion for animals, to love them at once emotionally and sexually was strong enough to satisfy the imperatives of my sexual drive and thus subdue my sadistic impulses; that I could build my actualized sexuality around love and caring and tenderness if I turned to animals. I am still today proud of that child for finding the road, which for him, led away from the abyss that then seemed so close.

By age 15, I had become a sexually active zoophile. (I should perhaps mention that by this time all memory of those two sadistic acts and all past sadistic fantasies were completely removed from conscious access). I was having sex with my neighbors dogs and longing for contact with horses. My own dog, an elderly bitch was entirely uninterested in my advances.

My first sexual experience was with a white haired dog (around age 13). We had mutual fellatio. He took me in his mouth, wrapped his tongue around my penis and then chewed hungrily on his tongue. Since then I have seen other dogs do this to themselves and so it is not too astounding. But, it was certainly better sex than I had ever dreamed of. When I began sucking him he stopped working me and pressed his muzzle against my groin and fucked my mouth with great enthusiasm. For nearly a year we got together several times a month for such sexual activities. This ended when he was hit by a car and I got my first taste of the grief of loss, which is the bitter price of zoophilia. You are doomed to out live many lovers.

School was very difficult after the 6th grade. In 7th grade I went to a school that was a combination Jr. and Sr. high school. I had taken an IQ test in elementary school that placed me in the advanced classes. But I was a shy and overly sensitive type and the noise and roughness of my classmates left me essentially nonfunctional. I went from an A student in elementary school to a D-E student in 7th grade, and soon developed test anxiety. After the first report-card I was moved from the 'advanced' section to the 'remedial' section. This was much worse than where I had been because I was now constantly teased for being a book worm and a weirdo. My only real interests (that I could show publicly) were classical music and the hard sciences. I hated sports. I was uninterested in girls.

When I was in the 7th grade, an elderly math teacher, during class, leaned down and placed his hand on my thigh. One of his fingers then worked over to my penis and squeezed it against my thigh. He did this while talking to me and the class about a math problem. He never did it again. A year later I heard other boys joking about him, saying 'well, at least he keeps 'it' to boys.' After I dropped out of school he was arrested for fondling a student. The incident had no effect on me as far as I can tell.

Between 14 and 16, I researched the subject of bestiality in the town library to the extent possible. I read the 'Satyricon' by Petronious, 'A Passion in the Desert' by Balzak and 'The Roan Stallion' by Robinson Jeffers. But none of these had much effect on my thinking because none of the writing reflected even a hint of understanding of the nature of animal sexuality. I found out from reading my state's statutes that I was a felon. This did have a substantial effect, because it strongly reinforced my view that I was an outcast, that society was my enemy. I also found a strong undercurrent of bestiality in Greek mythology and from Herodotus learned of bestiality in Egyptian religious practices (that goat of Mendes, Banebtet). These sources did have some effect in laying seeds of ideas that lie dormant but still (I think) retain the power of germination 35 years later. The 'Satyricon' was as close as I got to exposure to pornography before the age of 20. I also found in that library a photo of a small bronze art nouveau sculpture of 'The Rape of Europa'... Europa stands confidently on the back of the bull. The bull's head is pulled back and straight up. Europa's hand is stretched out over his muzzle and the bull's tongue licks her hand. That work inspired in me substantial interest in bulls.

Somewhere between 15 and 16, I began working part time at a local stable and there had sexual contact with every horse there that would allow me the privilege. There also I had my first sexual contact with a bull. Love with a horse eluded me however, and though the sex was good, the emotional bonding that I sought was not found. I was not prepared for the fact that they are, emotionally, not dogs. Also I was disappointed to find that the glans penis of a horse enlarges to such an extent that one can not take them by mouth when they are fully erect.

I took many chances while working at the stable when I was 16 through 20 years of age. The risks were both of discovery and of injury. Most stallions react mildly to the first sexual approach by a human. A minority react with violent hostility, another minority, only one in my experience at the stable, react with violent passion and try to rape you. I was always cautious and lucky and was never hurt while working with full size horses. I am by nature, a risk aversive person and my sexual life is the only contra-indicator to that. This is only explained by the force of my sexual drive which all I know leads me to believe is far from the center of the gaussian distribution curve. During my youth it was truly irresistible.

You say you have had sexual relations with a 1700 lb. bull? Well, you know, the surprising thing is that for bulls, sex is 99% slow, gentle foreplay consisting mostly of just standing next to the beloved breathing

heavily and necking as it were. This behavior translates well. If you start your relationship when they are very young and kiss them often (they are very oral creatures and will reject you if you refuse them this) you can become close enough to their hearts and their genitals to participate in a lot of most excellent necking, hugging, kissing, licking, and nuzzling. However, even for this, some care is required. They can be a bit like a bull in a china shop so to speak, and can step on you quite by accident. None the less, if you raise them with love and gentleness they will generally grow up to be loving gentle animals. (On the other hand, cowboys are macho ass holes). And as to that last 1%, the erect penis of a bull is not too large in diameter to fit in most human orifices, but it is dangerously long. The orgasmic consummation is most often a single spasm of great force in which the penis is thrust forward several feet. Once the bull is erect this may be induced by simply grasping the penis. But some bulls can manage a more or less passive ejaculation given the right kind of stimulation (the graphic details of which I will spare you).

My order of sexual preference is consistent with the sexual appeal of a species' sexual fragrance (referring to the males). In order, these are bulls and stallions. The fragrance of buck goats (emanating not from their gonads but from glands on their heads and sometimes spotted elsewhere around their bodies) is intriguing but it 'sticks' and my wife finds it very offensive, won't let me in the house 'reeking of goat' so I have given up reeking goats. The fragrance of boar semen is simultaneously strongly sexually stimulating and repellent. (For semen this scent is uniquely penetrating and overpowering and it permeates a boar from breath to flesh). And though I find pigs very intelligent and interesting animals, I have not pursued the development of any relationship with them because of this... My attempts to have relations with sheep have not worked out well. I seem to be allergic to ram semen, and I don't really care for the way they smell, especially when wet. My sexual attraction to dogs is minimal. 'They don't smell right.' However my affection and respect for them is greater than for any other animal.

I was once visiting some friends when their cat came up to me and straddled the toe of my shoe and began to rub her vulva against it. I moved my foot in sympathy with her until the wife of my friend saw what was going on and rushed over and swooped up the cat as though protecting her from harm. 'How truly weird you straights are,' I thought to myself. In fact, I have no sexual interest in cats but I will gladly assist, as best I can, any animal that explicitly requests sexual gratification from me. It is not in my nature to do the same for humans.

(U.G. had five different psychotherapists throughout his life, and was diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder). The characteristic depression of bipolar disorder has been diminishing over the last 15 years or so, and I do not think that my current depression is part of that disease. Three factors are, I think, at work in the present situation. One is that I have had not much direction in the past 2 years since I quit my job. I am a person who is most happy when strongly goal directed. As remedy, I have begun taking lessons in gardening and am contemplating building a green house. Second, is the seriously deteriorating health of 3 of my 4 friends. Friends who date back to my teens and for whom there can be no replacement. It is no joke that it takes a long time to make an old friend. And my very sweet and special little horse of 18 years has a degenerative disease that limits his life expectancy to 2 or 3 years more. I will not likely see another like him in my life. Thirdly, though I do not feel suicidal, I do, for the first time in my life, fully understand a term I have read used in the explanation of the high rate of suicide among older men: 'diminished prospects...'

"I am sick. I prefer animals to humans"

"Yale" was a 43-year-old married man with four children. He saw a posting about the study on the Internet. Raised by both his parents, Yale was a Jehovah's Witness who attended religious services about five times a week. A graduate of a two-year Technical School, Yale was a lathe operator who earned between \$30,001 and \$40,000. His two closest friends were his wife and his mother, and he rated himself as a "4" on the (1 to 5) sociability scale. Yale reported he surfed the Internet about 14 hours a week, although he had no friends he visited on the Internet.

Yale reported he was not abused during his childhood in any way, however, the one counselor he saw tried to explain his animal sex as a result of being ignored too much when Yale was young. He never tried to commit suicide, but noted that "If I would have tried, I would not fail." Yale related that during the year prior to the study he was "unhappy most of the time."

Yale was 22 when he had his first intercourse. Since then he had four different women sex partners, including prostitutes, and during the year prior to the study, he had sex only with his wife, about four times a week. Yale had one homosexual experience with a stranger when he was 26 years old. He masturbated about five times a week, and his favorite sexual fantasy was about “having sex with animals.” Yale’s sexual philosophy — “I am sick. I prefer animals to humans. Can’t get thoughts of animals out of my head.”

Yale did not grow up on a farm, but he used to help on the neighbor’s farm, and would see animals mating. He also had raccoons as pets. At the time of the study, he did not live on a farm, but had birds, fish, and a dog. Yale’s first sexual encounter with an animal occurred when he was 12 years old, with the neighbors’ dog: “I was walking home from the neighbor’s farm, taking a short cut through the fields. His dog followed. When out of sight of people, I took off my cloths, got down on my knees, and stroked his penis. Didn’t take much of that, then he walked behind me and mounted me. It felt wonderful. I liked it very much. He was sexually satisfied. I remained on all fours till he was finished.”

Yale related that he began having sex with animals because he had “fantasies about sex with animals” and “I felt I could only trust animals.” He added: “They didn’t gossip, they didn’t laugh at me, they were available most any time.” When asked why he continued to have sex with animals, Yale replied: “I want to die.” Since his first sexual experience with that dog, Yale had sexual relations with about 23 different animals. During the year prior to the study, he had sex with two different animals, altogether four times. He rated himself as a “4=both animal sex and human sex, but more animal sex” on the Kinsey-like scale of sexual orientation toward animals. It seemed as though Yale was conflicted, however, about having an emotional attachment to animals. In one question he reported he first realized he was psychologically/emotionally attracted to animals at age 12, and in another question he related: “I do not have an emotional attachment to animals. Just sexual.”

When Yale had sex with female animals, he always had vaginal-penile intercourse with them. When he had sex with male animals, he always had the animal perform anal sex on him. Yale’s favorite animal sex partners were male dogs. He also liked equine and bovine of both genders. When asked what he thought the animals felt about having sex with him, Yale responded: “Sexually satisfied. In males, they stop ejaculating. In females, I’m not so sure, but they walk up to me and turn their back end to me.”

He was never caught having sex with an animal, and until the age of 32, he did not know that there were others who had sex with animals. Six people knew about Yale’s animal sex: his wife, counselor, and four elders in his church. “The elders showed me in the Bible that it is wrong to have sex with animals... My wife was not happy, but is understanding and is giving me another chance.” He further related — “after being married for six years I told my wife. She was upset. I think disgusted with me. Felt hurt. But she said ‘not hurt as much as if it would have been another woman.’”

Yale believed having sex with animals was a perversion: “The reason for sex is procreation. The Bible states ‘each according to its kind.’ In other words, humans having sex with animals cannot bring forth another life. Lastly the Bible condemns having relations with animals.” When asked if he would like to stop having sex with animals, Yale related: “Yes. I do not want to hurt anyone, especially my wife and family.” When asked how having sex with animals influenced his life-style, he reported: “I try to avoid being around any animals, even seeing them — very hard to do.”

At the end of his questionnaire, Yale added the following: “Since my teens I knew it was not right to have sex with animals. But I could not stop. I thought it was because I was a loner and if I would get married the thoughts about animals would stop. I married when I was 27 years old. Very bad mistake. Having four kids makes it worse, trying to find a way out — to stop with the animals, and at the same time looking to have more sex with them.”

Exclusively animal sex

“Julius” was a 28-year-old, single man, who lived in Germany. A journalist, living by himself, he reported having about 10 close friends whom he met or talked to on a daily basis. On the sociability scale, he rated himself in the middle: “3=sometimes likes to be with people, has several friends.” Raised by both his parents and his grand-mother, Julius reported that his parents had extremely high expectations of him and that

he feared disappointing them. He had seen three different psychotherapists, mainly for his depression. He related that when he told them about his animal sex, their reactions varied “from curiosity to helplessness. Sometimes I felt like a lab rat.” During the year prior to the study, Julius reported he was “sometimes fairly unhappy.”

Julius was never sexually abused. In fact, he never had any sexual contact with a human being! He reported masturbating about 10 times per week, and the only sexual fantasy he engaged in was “having sex with animals.” Julius’ sexual philosophy — “Everything is okay as long as all partners involved are able to express their will and are consenting.” He didn’t grow up on a farm, nor did he live on a farm at the time of the study. While growing up, Julius reported he had no pets or animals. At the time of the study, he owned a horse.

Julius’ first sexual encounter with an animal occurred when he was about 12 years old, with a male dog, while visiting friends of his parents. He masturbated the dog several times, and reported it was exciting, “a fulfilment of a dream. No guilt feelings as the animal enjoyed it too.” Since then, Julius had sexual relations with about 140 different animals, and during the year prior to the study, he had sex once or twice a week with about 30 different animals altogether. His favorite sexual activities with the animals, males and females, were masturbating them and performing oral sex on them. Julius reported he began and continued to have sex with animals because he “was sexually attracted to the animal.” He further added that “having fantasies about sex with animals” contributed to his first sexual encounter with an animal. Julius rated himself as a “6=exclusively animal sex” on the Kinsey-like scale of sexual orientation toward animals.

Julius told about 10 people about his zoophilia; his mother, a few close friends, and fellow zoophiles. He related: “I tried to find out their general attitude towards zoophilia and prepared them and myself as good as possible. It was important for me that all accepted it as an important part of me, but also that it doesn’t change their whole image of me. It was interesting to see that those whom I considered more liberal sometimes had more problems to cope with that, but nearly all finally did.” When asked if he would like to stop having sex with animals, Julius related: “I am not sure at all. This was the question which made me end my last therapy, because my therapist tried to force me stopping. If there would be any reasonable alternative for me, I might, but I don’t see any.”

When asked how has the fact that he had sex with animals influenced his life-style, Julius explained: “The feeling of being different ruled my life for a long time. For a period of several years zoophilia became the main topic of my thoughts and actions — that was when I first met other zoophiles. Now I consider it an important, but not ruling or dominating, part of my life.”

At the end of the questionnaire, Julius wrote the following essay —

“Every society relies to a large extent on taboos. A lot of them are useful or even essential, others are arbitrary or even discriminating. Many of those senseless taboos were abandoned, but a few still exist. Zoophilia is one of them.

No zoophile — in the original sense of the word — is hurting anyone, either animal or human being. Still we are among the most hated: whereas killing or torturing animals for pleasure is considered in many cases socially acceptable, having consensual sex still isn’t. We seem to be the pariahs for the self-righteous of all colors: the politically correct accuse us of abusing animals whereas the ‘moral majority’ hates us for violating the ‘laws of god’ and/or nature. How stupid their arguments, how inconsistent their points may be — it is irrelevant for most people as long as they serve as a rationalization of their hate.

It is just too easy to hate us: most people don’t have zoophile tendencies or find ways to compensate them. Zoophiles don’t have any social structure, not to mention a lobby or pressure groups so they can’t defend themselves. I am convinced that the only reason we have not fought more is that most people don’t know we exist and most zoophiles keep quiet. An example, in 1996 I confessed anonymously in a nationwide TV talk show (in Germany) that I am a zoophile. I gave up the idea to produce any tolerance or even understanding for zoophiles long ago, my main intention was to tell other ‘closet zoos’ that they are not alone out there. No other topic has ever provoked more negative reactions on that show. The network received over 1000 hate mails, calls, death threats etc. That show is still the No. 1 example for ‘how low TV can sink’ in German media.

This situation has severe consequences for many zoos. They retreat from society, live in fear to be outed, can’t communicate about their needs, problems etc. Over the years I got to know quite a few of these

‘closet zoos.’ The majority of them suffers from depressions and other psychological problems, most of them don’t have too many social contacts.

Although sexual contacts with animals is legal in Germany since 1969, it is still prosecuted, often with undemocratic or even illegal means. All zoos I know who were harassed by police or the legal system here, kept quiet to prevent public humiliation, so that the officials abusing their position and power to fight us feel even more self-assured.

In some aspects our situation is similar to the one of gays 30 years ago, but it is also different. I don’t think there will ever be something like a ‘zoo community’ and even if we are able to found one, the prejudices against us are so deep that I don’t see any real chance to change them. The fewer taboos are left, the more they are supported, no matter how senseless they may be. The fact that even gay associations are refusing to help zoophiles or are even taking active part in anti-zoo measures speaks for itself.

I gave up the idea that actual knowledge will help much to break up the prejudice and hate against us. Still I hope that it might contribute to some professional understanding and this way to a sensible therapy for those zoos who really want one. My experiences with ‘professional’ therapists were mostly negative, in fact so bad that my last one nearly drove me into suicide. I want to prevent any other zoos from having similar experiences.”

“There is something more straightforward and earthy in animal sex”

“Charles” was a 34-year-old, single man. Raised by both his parents, never abused in any way, and was earning more than \$100,000 annually. Together with his questionnaire, he sent an attachment in which he elaborated on the questions in the questionnaire. Let me share with you some of his responses, so that you can read Charles’ story in his own words —

“I’m in a somewhat atypical situation right now, so I don’t see my mates as much as I’d like. I’m currently living in the US (doing the Silicon Valley thing) and many of my mates are back in the UK, so I only get to see them a couple of times a year, which bites. However, things are progressing well at work, to the point that I will be able to move back to the UK later this year.

I live some miles outside of the valley, and work from home except on one day a week, when I go into the office to meet with the other engineers, and in the evening I usually go and see friends in the area. Under normal circumstances I’d go out on weekends too, but right now pressure of work is high.

During such times I tend to ‘go trogloditic’ and just sit and code all day and not go out or socialize much. I can handle this pretty well, being used to living on my own and very enthusiastic about the work, but I am looking forward to when the pressure’s off a bit, and I’ll be back in the UK leading a slightly more normal social life.

I have three sheep, but they are back in the UK — it wasn’t practical to bring them out here (and I didn’t think it’d be kind to them). They are currently being looked after by some (non-zoo) friends of mine, and I’ll bring them back to live with me when I return later this year.”

Charles’ sexual philosophy — “I believe that if sexual acts are consensual and do not harm anyone, then no matter how strange they might seem, if people want to enjoy such activities and do not force others to either view or participate, then they should be allowed to do so. Realizing that one is a zoophile, and realizing that the prevailing attitude of conventional society towards one’s own sexual preferences is one of intolerance and hostility, leads one to question one’s own ethics very thoroughly. Having done so and come to the conclusion that you’re really not being ‘evil,’ only different, tends to incline you towards tolerance of others’ differences too. I would not condone sexual contact with children, which is clearly harmful to the child. However, I have friends who are into things like S/M which I wouldn’t enjoy, but I have no problems with them enjoying themselves in their own way. It would be hypocritical in the extreme to expect people to accept me as a zoophile and then discriminate against others for their own deviancies from the norm.

Basically I was overwhelmingly more sexually attracted to animals than I was to humans. I was and am by no means misanthropic, and I enjoy and value my close friendships with humans greatly — I am just not

particularly sexually attracted to them. I enjoy stimuli that are not often found in human sexual relationships — for example, I am highly turned on by olfactory stimuli, and humans by convention rarely allow themselves to have any natural human aroma. Artificial perfumes leave me completely cold, as do conventional standards of ‘attractiveness’ and ‘beauty.’ There is something altogether more straightforward and earthy in the experience of animal sex, and it is that which I seek in my sexual activities.”

Charles’ first sexual encounter with an animal, at 15 — “I was out for a walk late at night, and I passed by a field where several donkeys were kept. Having fantasized about animal contact many times before, I took the opportunity to enter the field and get close to the animals. One female was pretty friendly, and I gave her a good skritch, and also copped a nice feel of her nether regions. She seemed a little put out by that, and wouldn’t remain still if I touched her there, so I desisted, and contented myself with more skritch and eventually brought myself to orgasm by rubbing against her side. I was very turned on by it, particularly by certain aromas that were left on the hand I’d been exploring with ;)

I only have sex with animals that are consenting. The issue of consent is frequently discussed, and for me it means if the animal is unwilling, it will show that in an obvious way — anything from just moving away from your advances, to kicking you in the goolies! I would have sex with an animal that just tolerated me, but by far the best and most rewarding experiences are obtained when the animal is evidently enjoying and enthusiastically participating in the encounter. In the case of my sheep, this was very obvious — when she was in season, my ewe would pursue me around the field, bleating vigorously and demanding to be satisfied, frequently many times a night! For me, it is a very big turn-on when the animal is obviously being very well stimulated, and enjoying the experience a great deal. It’s very obvious when that happens, and the act of giving such great pleasure doubles the pleasure that I feel in return.

Male animals in particular seem to be very enthusiastic participants, and there have been occasions where the animal has almost knocked me flying in his enthusiasm to begin sexual activity. Although I have little inclination towards homosexuality in humans (I’ve got no antipathy towards it, just that I haven’t met a male human yet that (a) I fancied, and (b) who fancied me) I do enjoy interacting sexually with animals of both genders. And it’s their pleasure that leads to the most rewarding experiences for me too.

I have four sisters, and they all know; all of my friends know; everyone in the company I work for knows. Some of them had to pause for a few moments to consider the ethics themselves and arrive at their own conclusions, but in all cases those conclusions have been the same as mine — that zoophilia is different, but not harmful or sociopathic. I have never lost a friend, or had anyone think any less of me either personally or professionally, through revealing my zoophile nature to them. If I am good enough friends with someone that we get on well, and I believe that they have enough sense to think the ethics through, then I tell them. If I get the feeling that someone will be offended by it, then I don’t press the issue. I have no reason to alienate myself from otherwise reasonable people, and no desire to upset them by forcing them to consider things they’re not emotionally and/or intellectually equipped to handle.

Working for a technology company is particularly cool, since engineers really don’t seem to be that bothered about the sexual orientation of their fellow engineers, and are only really concerned about whether or not you can hack the code!”

When asked if he would like to stop having sex with animals, Charles responded: “Definitely not! I enjoy it very much, so do the animals, neither my friends or my employers think less of me because of it, and I do not believe it to be unethical. It can be a bit frustrating that the majority of society have yet to emerge from the ethical Dark Ages and still believe that we are somehow nasty individuals, but I believe in my own ethical code sufficiently that I have no desire to give up something that I enjoy so much, and which does no harm to anyone else. I can live an enjoyable life, have many friends and enjoy success in my work, without having to stop enjoying animal sex.”

When asked how having sex with animals influenced his life style, Charles related: “Well, it’s given me a taste for living in a rural setting — even if I’m not actively having sex with animals, I still prefer living in the country, and although I like to visit the city, I’d not want to live there. My work is ideally suited to telecommuting anyway, and it’s cool that as of autumn this year I’ll be working for a Silicon Valley company from the comfort of my own home in the UK via the Internet, so I’ll be able to enjoy my ideal lifestyle — in the

country, with a nice variety of beasties, and some truly awesome computing hardware and complete creative freedom :-)

The main reason I moved to the country in the first place was so that I could get a bit of land and keep my own beasties. I grew up in a small town, and although the countryside was only a few minutes walk away, we never kept the kind of animals that I was deeply attracted to.

It might be fun if I came across a human who also enjoyed playing with the animals — that's about the only circumstance under which I'd form a sexual relationship with a human, and the animals would always be involved, too. I have some good friends to whom I am very close, even to the extent where we will sometimes sleep together, just for the proximity — but they understand that I do not want to have sex with them, and can handle that and not feel offended. Some humans I have known to be upset when I didn't want to have sex with them — they considered it to be somehow their deficiency, even though I explained that I had a different sexuality. When I come across a human who I can be close to, and yet understands that I don't want to have sex with them and doesn't get upset, I value that very, very much.

I suppose it would be nice to find another human who also enjoyed the animals, and who wanted to share a relationship with me, and sex with the animals — I'd enjoy the human companionship, and yet still be able to enjoy my sexual activities with the animals. But I have found no such person yet, although I'd be interested if the situation ever did arise. I'm not going to stress out looking for such a thing though. If it happens, fine, but if it doesn't, I'm happy as I am, anyway.”

Charles ended with the following note — “The act of meeting with other zoophiles in recent years has made me a lot happier to be who I am. One of the scariest things which would occasionally make me upset was for years thinking I was the only zoophile I'd ever know — I knew there were others, but there was no obvious way of meeting them. It had a profound effect on me to finally meet such people and to discover that they were usually kind, articulate, and ethically sound people, and not monsters after all. It validated everything I had come to realize about myself, and reassured me that my ethics were sound. Although I rarely get to see other zoophiles at the moment, being busy at work and with many of them being geographically dispersed, it does me a lot of good to know that at least I am not alone. I have many friends who accept my proclivities, yet who can never really understand. I find it wonderful to be around people who actually do :-)”

“Having a non-zoo for my wife has been difficult”

“Edward” was a 19-year-old, college student, and already married. Raised Baptist by both his parents, he attended religious services approximately once a month. He reported having six close friends with whom he hangs out “constantly.” Edward rated himself as a “4” on the introvert/extrovert scale, and explained: “somewhat shy, only get along with certain people.” Edward suffered from Attention Deficit Disorder, and for that was seen by one psychotherapist who was not told about Edward's animal sex. At the time of the study, Edward reported he was “very happy most of the time.”

He reported experiencing no childhood abuse. Yet in subsequent questions, Edward related that a female relative and a male stranger who were at least five years older than he was at that time, touched him sexually before the age of puberty. They fondled his genitals, performed oral sex on him, and he performed oral sex on at least one of them. Edward further related that he had sexual relations with a cousin at the age of seven, and with his brother at the age of eight. His first homosexual sexual experience was with that male stranger, when he was six years old. Since then Edward had five different male sex partners. In the year prior to the study, Edward had sex with three different men, altogether four times. His first sexual intercourse occurred with his then future wife, at the age of 18. She was the only woman partner Edward ever had. At the time of the study, they were having sexual relations about four times a week.

Edward did not grow up on a farm, and at the time of the study did not live on a farm either. He grew up with cats, dogs, birds, and fish, but at the time of the study he had no pets or animals. His favorite sexual fantasies are “having sex with animals” and “animals having sex with animals.” Edward's first sexual encounter with an animal occurred when he was 12, with his cat “I was using a vibrating back massager to get an orgasm when the cat walked by. I decided to see if she could orgasm too. I used the massager on her and she did have an orgasm. I felt like I was doing something good. I enjoyed giving her what she couldn't get any

other way (she's spayed). I think she enjoyed it because she kept posturing for more." Edward added "At 12 I found that I could make our cat orgasm. I enjoyed giving her that pleasure. At 14 I realized I could fall in love with animals."

Since that first experience with his cat, Edward had four other dogs as sex partners. In the year prior to the study, he only had one sexual experience with an animal. He rated himself as a "3=equally animal and human sex" on the Kinsey-like scale of sexual orientation toward animals. Edward reported he always masturbated the animals and had them perform oral sex on him when engaging in sexual contact with them. He also performed oral sex on them. Edward defined himself as a zoophile — "because I love the animals and would never force them into sex or casually have sex with an animal. I consider the love and care for them more important than sex."

Edward related that five of his friends and his wife knew about his animal sex. "All were very accepting and a couple had done animal sex as experimentation. My wife was a different matter. It took her over a year to accept it fully." When asked if he would like to stop having sex with animals, Edward replied: "I tried to wipe out the zoo aspect of me when I attended church camp when I was 16. I was miserable while I was trying, so I decided that the more love I have the better." When asked how having had sex with animals influenced his life-style, Edward related: "I go watch horses at stables every once in a while. Zoophilia was the primary reason for me to get on the Internet. I am more tolerant of other people because of my zoophilia."

At the end of the questionnaire, Edward added the following — "Having a non-zoo for my wife has been difficult. Before we got married we had many arguments over how much I loved her. Before she understood and accepted my zoophilia she couldn't see how I could love her and them at the same time. At one point earlier in my life I also had doubts about it. After I accepted it I pursued it more. Just before I went to college I saw a newspaper article about usenet news groups and noticed one called alt.sex.bestiality. That's when I finally knew there were others like me.

If it weren't for the support on the net, then I wouldn't be as secure and happy as I am. I have friends on Sleepy's Forest that I can (and have) visit. I don't have much access to dogs. I moved to this city nine months ago and don't have any friends with large dogs. I don't fence hop, so that also limits my contact with dogs. I live in a pet-free apartment complex, so that rules out owning one. For a time we did have dogs living in the apartment until management found out.

My parents are VERY religious. My dad is the minister at the largest Baptist church in the city. My mom is in the church's board of directors. I am fairly sure that if they found out they would be upset, disappointed, and angry with me. I don't know if I will ever tell them."

"My first sexual contact was with my guide dog"

"William" was a married, 44-year-old blind man. In order to participate in this study he scanned the questionnaire into his computer, and answered all the questions on the computer with the help of a special device he had on his screen, allowing him to read and type on the computer. He then printed his answers and sent them back to me. His writings, some of which I would like to share with you, give insight into the very special bond established with his dogs —

"My first sexual contact was with Princess, my guide dog. I had been with Princess since 1970 and our first sexual experience happened in 1974. I was two months out of High School when I met Princess. I had dreamed of having a guide dog since I was six or seven years old. So Princess and I bonded quickly and tightly. We went through four years of college, my wedding, my first sexual contacts with female humans and my first job together, among many, many other things. When I was a lonely, hard-driving college freshman, Princess was about the only friend I had. We learned an entire new universe together — a strange college campus. We were together almost constantly, separated only when I had chemistry or biology labs which would, in and of themselves, pose great danger to her safety. We became like one organism, responding to each other's actions and moods without commands, without words at all. We ate, slept, worked, studied and partied together.

Gradually, I realized that people were treating me differently than the people who traveled with white canes. They came up and asked questions about Princess. How old is she? How long have you had her? Does

she know how to judge traffic lights? Does she bite? . . . and a hundred more. People were actually walking up and initiating conversations with me! This was something new, something radically different from the teasing I had experienced most of my school life. Using their questions as icebreakers, I began to actually make friends, to be invited out for pizza or to parties. I feel I owe it all to Princess. I met my wife of 23 years partially because of Princess as well.

Patience, dear reader. I'll get back on topic, I swear. I have written all this to try to give you a faint glimmer of understanding of the bond that develops between a guide dog and his/her handler. I want you to see that I loved Princess with all my being — that when we finally had sex, I wasn't just using her like an animated sex toy — that I would never have done anything to hurt her or cause her pain. I had not, in other words, been 'setting her up' for sexual use or anything like that. What happened between us on that cold February day in 1974 happened spontaneously and would never have happened again if Princess had not given me what I interpreted to be overwhelming approval afterward. Instead, it deepened our bond even further, being something that we and we alone shared.

Actually, the first time I had sex with a dog was about a month after my engagement. My wife accepted my marriage proposal in January and Princess and I had our first sexual encounter in February.

It had been an unusually cold winter. When my future wife wasn't sleeping over, I would allow Princess up on the bed and under the covers to get warm. Well, I started having wet dreams. I thought I'd outgrown them years ago, but they came back. I dreamed of dogs ... horses ... all kinds of weird things. I had been sleeping with Princess for several months by then. Since I had the dreams only when my wife-to-be wasn't sleeping with me, I attributed the dreams to a function of sexual deprivation. It never occurred to me that they might be a function of sleeping snuggled so closely and warmly with Princess.

So, it's early February. My fiancé is away for a conference for a few days. We hadn't had sex for a fortnight or so because she had her period. Princess had been having trouble with her anal glands. Dogs have scent glands at approximately the four o'clock and seven o'clock positions around the opening of the anus. Though she was well exercised, Princess' glands tended to fill. When they did, she would emit a strong, musky odor which everybody but me found repulsive. The day my fiancé left I noticed they were full again and I decided to empty them. I took her outside to empty her bowels. She was a very obedient girl and did as asked. We went back inside and I began the gentle squeezing motion that would aid her in emptying her anal glands. She yipped! There was some soreness there, probably caused by the filled musk sacks, so I decided to lube up, enter the rectum with my fingers and express them that way. I had been raised around dogs and other animals all my life. We raised dogs, so routine procedures like this were well known to all us kids. So I got out the KY jelly, smeared some on my index finger and gently entered her. I expressed the glands without further trouble, though I could tell by the way she acted that Princess felt much relieved.

Then, her anal muscles started doing what anal muscles are supposed to do and I thought about how good it would feel to have the same thing happen to my cock as was now happening to my finger. Her rectum was empty and relaxed and looked plenty big enough to accept me ... but ... the guilt set in. I decided not to do it, but I noticed that her tail, rather than attempting to clamp down over her ass was pointing sharply upward. Obviously, she didn't mind my finger ... so ... No. I pulled out and wiped the excess KY from myself and from her, patted her, told her she was a gooooood dog and let her loose. She ran into the bedroom, jumped on the bed and lay down. Then she jumped down, ran in, bopped my hand with her nose, ran back in and jumped back on the bed. It was the same signal she always gave when I was studying late and she felt it was high time I got some sleep.

Well, that did it. She had never done anything like that in the middle of the day before. So we did it. I went in and stripped off in record time. We got into bed and under the covers. We began snuggling warmly together. She began licking my face and squirming around so her ass contacted my thigh. To me it was like saying, 'come on! I'm available!' I squirted more KY up her ass and spread some on my cock. She was lying on her side with her back to me. I simply got up, lay down on top of her and guided my cock into her willing, lubricated twitching ass. My cock went in so easily ... and ... those muscles did to my dick what they had done to my finger. No rubbers, no precautions, and the best damn sex I'd ever had! She took my whole length without difficulty. She lay there and never made a sound, licking my hand and cheek all the while. The orgasm I had that day was the best I've ever had, before or since. It was like opium! It was a pleasure so simple,

primitive and pure that it caused a fundamental change in not only my sexual preferences but the way I looked at animals and humans from that day forward.

All good things must end ... this did too. I figured that she'd leap away when I was through, but when I pulled out and rolled over on my back, she stayed right beside me. She cleaned herself up, then licked the sheet awhile and, as I lay there thinking about right and wrong and rape, she began licking my limp cock, my stomach, my balls ... carefully, never exposing a tooth, I never felt anything but tongue. We lay there a long time ... we slept ... No dreams, just rest. When I awoke, Princess was still right beside me, sleeping peacefully, making those contented little sounds she always made while sleeping. I checked her carefully. No apparent soreness ... no blood ... I wondered what diseases I'd get ... Wondered about the kind of sicko pervert I had become. Cliches floated through my mind like 'can something that feels this right be so wrong?' etc. Well, I held her in my arms and told her how sorry I was ... that I hoped I didn't hurt her ... that we'd never do that again But we did it again that night ... and again the next afternoon! By then, she was becoming rather blatant about the whole thing, running up to me, burying her nose in my crotch and then trotting daintily off to jump up on the bed.

My fiancé came back and I started wrestling with it ... is it a disease? genetics? or maybe you're just sick! Maybe you ought to just stop right now ... but I never did. I was still wrestling with it 15 months later when we got married ... I was still wrestling with it when Princess died eight years later. Still wrestling at the birth of my daughter and I guess, I'm still wrestling with it to some extent today. Although I have come to accept what I am, I live with the ever-present fear of getting caught. Then, too, there is the relatively short lifespan of those whom I choose to have as lovers. In a way, I've been a widower four times already. Still, I'll not stop unless forced by circumstances or old age to do so. I've been very lucky so far. I haven't been caught. I haven't ever gotten any kind of disease. I've never had a lover change her mind and turn on me. I've never been bitten, even accidentally and I have been privileged to experience raw, elemental pleasure of a kind most humans will never know.

I don't suppose I'll live to see it, but I dream of the day when our society can accept zoophiles in the same way we are learning to accept gays. I find it very interesting that many of our most virulent opponents come from the gay community — a group whining and yelping about 'acceptance' of differing life styles and sexual preferences. Still, there are so few of us that I suspect that acceptance will be a long time coming.

I should think the consequences of being discovered would be disastrous to most zoophiles, but for me, they would be devastating. Every supporter of every Guide Dog School would come down on me like the proverbial ton of bricks. There would be a file on me at every place where a dog guide might be obtained. Although he is not one of my sexual partners, there is no doubt that I would lose my current guide and be unable to obtain another.

I view participation in this study as the single greatest risk I have ever run. I chose to do it anyway because something must be done to try to clear up the myths and misunderstandings about zoophiles that permeate not only society in general but, according to my research, clinical thinking as well. Somebody has to start somewhere. A beginning must be made and this study is, I hope and believe, a start to that beginning. I am willing to risk all to help things along.

Meantime, I would be content to live alone and invisibly with my animals. I plan to do just that after my daughter leaves home. People and the games they play sicken me! I interact with them only in so far as it is necessary to earn an income and no more. To earn the love of an animal, to have her welcome me into her body, to know that I am okay with her and to accept and be accepted by another species is reward enough for me.

I have a recurring dream, several times a year. I am looking for something or cleaning up and I open a little closet door. Out bounds one of my long departed lovers. She's a little thin, hungry and thirsty, but always glad to see me and glad, too, that I finally came and let her out. 'Sheba!' I cry. 'Oh, I'm so sorry! I thought you were dead!' And for that time in that dream we romp together, work together, love together. Sometimes, in the dream, we encounter acquaintances who remark on the fact that Sheba or Princess or Snowball or whomever is back and looking great! I don't know what the dream means, if, indeed, it means anything, but I love it when they come back to visit."

EPILOGUE

A lot has happened since I sent out the questionnaires and collected my data in 1996. As I mentioned before, there are currently two research projects being done about zoophilia. Drs. Martin Weinberg and Colin Williams from Indiana University at Bloomington, Indiana, have been conducting a study through the Internet. From what I saw when one zoo emailed me their questionnaire, Drs. Weinberg and Williams' questions are very similar to mine, yet more elaborate. I can't wait to see their results. Ms. Andrea Beetz, a psychology doctoral student from the University of Erlangen in Germany, has been sending out questionnaires, which include personality tests, to zoos around the world. She also personally interviewed many of them.

According to Beetz (in an email dated 3/1/01), in her preliminary results based on 113 men who had sexual experiences with animals, and who completed six questionnaires via the Internet, the participants showed significantly lower scores of psychopathy than the norm. Beetz further notes that the majority of her subjects were interested in other people and their needs, were good judges of personalities and feelings of people, and were empathic and helpful. She suggests that these characteristics could be an effect of practicing interpretation of nonverbal communication with animals and/or the result of dealing with crises which can be a catalyst of development. On the other hand, Beetz found indications for problems in interpersonal relationships for her subjects, and they reported difficulties getting close to people. On a "sociability" scale, they described themselves as rather shy and less sociable in comparison to the norm. They were also less conforming to rules and regulations. The average age of these 113 men was 30. Of them, 34.50 percent were Americans and 56 percent were Europeans (32% were Germans). Seventy percent had at least some college education, and more than 12 percent had graduate degrees and above. Seventy-three percent were single at the time of her data collection, and 27 percent were married or lived with a steady partner. Twenty-three percent of the participants only had sexual relations with animals, and 54 percent reported they had sex with animals on a regular basis (often several times a week). Fifty-seven percent of the participants reported that sexual contact with animals was more important to them than sex with humans. Seventy-six percent reported their relationship with animals is like the relationship that others have to a human partner. In most cases, the animals involved were dogs and horses, but also farm animals and in very few cases, even large cats (tigers) and dolphins. Only 60 percent of the subjects owned animals, and 34.50 percent reported being active in animal protection.

As previously discussed in the literature review, the Humane Society of the United States, in 1998, launched a First Strike Campaign against animal cruelty. The Humane Society considers sexual contact with animals as animal abuse and often an overlooked form of animal cruelty. The campaign addresses the connection between animal cruelty and human violence by promoting strong legislation dealing with animal cruelty, providing information and resources to communities, and encouraging the public to treat animal cruelty as a serious crime. What's interesting is that when I started researching bestiality and zoophilia, in 1996, I called the Humane Society and asked if they had any literature about it. The person who answered my call was puzzled at my request and said: "Why should we have literature about people having sex with animals? They don't harm the animals." I understood this to be a reflection of the philosophy of the Humane Society, and unfortunately, I did not record this person's name.

As part of its campaign, the Humane Society has launched an effort to enact laws prohibiting "animal sexual abuse" in the states that don't have such laws. According to the Humane Society's web site (www.hsus.org), as of January 1999, eight states (California, Delaware, Georgia, North Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin) have laws that address sexual abuse of animals exclusively. Another 16 states lump animal sexual abuse with such activities as having sex with a dead human being or with a minor child. Overall, 24 states have laws that prohibit sexual activity with animals, and 26 states have no law outlawing this activity. Sex with an animal is a felony in five states and a misdemeanor in 19. Maximum penalties go as high as \$50,000 in Montana, while Massachusetts and Rhode Island may imprison "offenders" for up to 20 years.

Another organization, Animal Sexual Abuse Information and Resource Site (ASAIRS), was recently formed, as "an animal welfare entity chartered and incorporated under the laws of the state of Missouri to promote awareness of, education about, and legislation against sexual abuse of animals" (from their web site — www.ASAIRS.com). ASAIRS has been sending emails everywhere, asking people to contact their legislators

“to get new Bills introduced and sponsored to help our four legged critters.” Specifically, ASAIRS has targeted Iowa, Missouri, Oregon, Texas, and New Mexico, and indeed, according to Richard (2001), in 2001, three states – Iowa, Maine, and Oregon – passed laws criminalizing bestiality.

For example, the proposed anti-bestiality Bill in Missouri reads: “1. No person shall knowingly engage in any sexual conduct with an animal or knowingly cause another person to engage in any sexual conduct with an animal for sexual gratification of any person. 2. Any person who violates the provisions of subsection 1 of this section is guilty of a class D felony.” The first hearing on this bill was held on April 5, 2000.

The person who founded ASAIRS, Mike Rolland (also known by other names), admits he is a “reformed” zoo (Richard, 2001). In a recent interview with Richard (2001) he related that since he was nine years old, he preferred dogs to humans because dogs were “non-threatening, emotionally and socially,” and because “having sex with other people is embarrassing for me” (Richard, 2001, p. 6). Mr. Rolland stated that he realized he was not the only zoophile when he discovered a web site for zoos on the Internet, several years ago. He became immersed in the zoo community, spending about 20 hours at a time online. When Mr. Rolland became suicidal, about two years later, he was diagnosed with Depression, Avoidant Personality Disorder, and with having characteristics of Anti-Social Personality Disorder. Rolland believes “the zoophilia was at the root of all of it.” He decided to stop his bestiality and turned against zoophilia, bestiality, and the people involved (Richard, 2001, p. 6).

Some zoos maintain that Rolland, a.k.a. “Zoobuster,” started attacking zoos in the news groups on the Internet and “outing” them. Many zoos had no choice but to disappear from the Internet. “Jim,” the zoo who invited me to the gathering, sold his house, disconnected his phone, and disappeared altogether. “Beverly” did the same. Stasya, too, had to move, and is now keeping a very low profile. “Zoobuster” did not stop there. He notified Internet servers about the content of their zoo web sites. He sent them multiple emails using his various names and addresses so that it would look like many different people were complaining about the zoo web sites. Many of the sites, consequently had to be shut off by their Internet servers.

One of the web sites that had to be shut down was www.actaeon.org. Several months later, the Freedom From Fear Foundation, a long-time supporter of free speech on the Internet, intervened and the site is now up and running again. When I checked the site on January 5, 2001, I was the 1,006,001st visitor since June 9, 1996.

Mr. Rolland dismisses my study, as well as Drs. Weinberg and Williams’, although he stated that he participated as a voluntary subject in both. In his opinion, the questions in the questionnaires were leading, the number of participants too small, and the zoos answered the questions in ways that would make them look good, instead of being honest (Richard, 2001). In an email from ASAIRS to an undisclosed recipient list, dated November 9, 2001, describing Mr. Rolland’s recent interview with Richard, the author of the email described the ASAIRS staff members and other animal rights activists’ efforts to sabotage Weinberg and Williams’ study. The author of the email alleges that since the study was conducted by using a multiple choice, “completely anonymous web based questionnaire,” they skewed the results of the study by using multiple accounts and identities to complete several questionnaires. The author of the email reported that all the questionnaires were accepted “and there were no safeguards against multiple submissions by the same person.” The author further labeled me as a “pro-zoophile” who “stuck up for the people who sexually abuse animals” (asairsInc@aol.com).

According to the Humane Society’s web site, in one search using the term “bestiality,” it found 85,771 documents, most of them promoting the sexual “abuse” of animals. There are numerous web sites, chat rooms, and pet forums exclusively devoted to animal sexual “abuse” and pornography. I found the following list of resources on the Humane Society’s web site in January of 1999:

FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions):

- [alt.sex.bestiality FAQ index and introduction](#)
- [alt.sex.bestiality FAQ](#)
- [The ASB “mini” FAQ](#)

The Zoophilia Report:

- a letter zoophiles can use to announce their coming out to family and friends

PIP (Periodic Information Posting) Files:

- Zoophilia and Your Health
- Zoophilia and the Law
- Zoophilia and the Law: History
- Zoophilia Bibliography
- Zoo-related Resources
- Zoophilia in Music and Art

How-To-Guides:

- Guide to Sex with Dogs/Bitches
- Guide to Sex with male Dogs
- Sex Guide: How to with Geese
- Dolphins: FAQ on Mating
- How to with Miniature Stallions
- How to have More Fun with your Stallion
- How to have More Fun with your Mare

Examples of Web Sites and Other Resources:

- Ian's Zoo Links
- Atruezoo
- Miami's
- CalZoo
- Actaeon's Zoo Page
- Dolphins Home Page
- White Shadows Zoophilia Story Room
- The Ultimate Zoo Page (UZP)
- Lintilla's 5010 Zoo Port
- Dobbin's page
- Kumba's Dog House
- Valadan's Stable
- Zoo Resources
- Animal Sexual Abuse on the Internet
- Zeta World
- Zoophoria
- Pet Lover
- Zoo Ring
- Wild Stallion's Web Page

Since the Humane Society does not want to encourage visitors to these sites but rather inform the public of their existence, it did not provide the addresses to these sites and postings.

Mark Matthews, the author of *The Horseman*, was invited to the "infamous" Jerry Springer Show. The show was titled "I married a horse." However it never aired. It was judged to be too controversial even for the Jerry Springer Show. When the show was taped (I have a copy of the video), the audience reacted with much shock, and started screaming when the horse, Pixel, was brought onto the stage.

In 1999, Channel 4 from London (Optomen Television Limited) did a documentary on zoophilia, titled *Animal Passions*. They did an excellent job depicting and explaining the issue of zoophilia. The producers came to the United States and interviewed several zoos, including Mark Matthews. They also interviewed Dr. John Money and other psychologists, and they show a brief segment of the three-hour interview they did with

me. A pointed statement was made, in my opinion, when Matthews' neighbors were being interviewed in their home: The wall behind them was full of heads of animal trophies... and they were saying that both Matthews and they "mounted" animals... Matthews passed away several weeks before the documentary aired in Britain.

I appear on that documentary saying: "Nobody asks animals whether they want to work for us, serve as food for us in a restaurant or eat them. Nobody asks the animals anything. People just take animals for granted. But when it comes to having sex with animals, all of a sudden people start feeling very uncomfortable with it, saying 'this is abuse.' But killing animals... that's okay because we eat them." I probably could have said it more eloquently, but the point was made. I received many angry phone calls and letters as a result.

In the Fall of 2000, I published some excerpts from this manuscript in www.ThePosition.com, which is an on-line magazine about sexuality. The editor linked the article to my web site (www.DrMiletski.com), and I was able to reconnect with many zoos who emailed me after reading the article. Most of them thanked me, again, for having done this study, and asked for the book. Others expressed their regret for not participating in the study and sent me lengthy emails and letters relating their life stories.

According to an email I received from a zoo, some of the zoos have been campaigning for "Zoo Civil Rights." With the help of an attorney, they are currently deliberating creating a legal organization which will provide psychological counseling and a suicide prevention service for zoos. The Zoophile Suicide Prevention Outreach Society (ZSOS) will provide psychological and legal counseling, and will lobby to change the laws that have kept zoos fearfully in the closet.

On December 3, 2000, an article titled *The Joy Of Beasts* by Mark Byrd, appeared in *The Independent (The Sunday Review)* in the United Kingdom. Byrd talks about my study and Ms. Beetz's research, and points out that bestiality/zoophilia "has never been more acceptable. In recent months there have been glossy photo-shoots involving models in suggestive poses with animals in... fashionable magazines... A recent television commercial for ice-cream appears to feature sexual interaction between a man and a dog and between a woman and a horse." Byrd goes on to relate that "In Germany and the Netherlands, and in 28 states in the USA, sexual relationships with animals are legal, while in Hungary, magazines dedicated to animal sex are sold openly in garages and book-shops. In Britain, on the other hand, it is an offence punishable by life imprisonment" (Byrd, 2000). According to the Sex Offences Review, Sentencing and Offences Unit in London, this punishment is currently under consideration to be reduced to five years imprisonment, so that the punishment will be fair, just, and fit for the twenty first century.

Martin Daily and Barry Fryer, who help run the Special Operations Unit in Britain (which is equivalent to the Humane Society of the United States), categorize all sexual liaisons with animals as abuse, and consider zoophilia to be inseparable from bestiality. Fryer further "argues that although we breed and kill animals for food, we must campaign for better welfare up until the point of their death. Although we keep them in captivity, we must ensure they suffer no psychological torture" (Byrd, 2000).

In March 2001, Peter Singer, "known as the father of the animal rights movement" (Richard, 2001, p. 1), and a Professor of Bioethics at Princeton University's Center for Human Values, noted that "Sex with animals does not always involve cruelty" and that raising animals to kill them is worse than mating with them (Richard, 2001, p. 1). Singer made these remarks in a review of the book *Dearest Pet: On Bestiality* by the Dutch biologist Midas Dekkers, for *Nerve*, an online magazine. The responses by *Slate*, the *New Republic*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and animal rights groups raged against Singer. They argued that animals cannot consent, and therefore sex with animals is rape (Richard, 2001).

I have published two articles about zoophilia. One was published in the *Scandinavian Journal of Sexology* and the other in the *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*. I was also interviewed for several journals, magazines and radio shows. I gave a presentation about my study at the annual conference of the American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists (AASECT) in San Francisco, California, in May 2001, which was very well received. And Ms. Beetz and I co-presented about bestiality and zoophilia at the World Congress of Sexology, in Paris, France, in June 2001.

So far, I have received 17 rejections from book publishers who refuse to publish this manuscript because of its "subject matter." If you just finished reading this book, then I have managed to overcome the publishing roadblock. I hope you found my efforts worthwhile.

REFERENCES

- Actaeon, & Hobbes. (1996-1997). *Zoo Code* [online]. Actaeon@usa.net.
- Animal Passions* (September 14, 1999). Television documentary, produced by Channel 4, Optomen Television Limited. London, United Kingdom.
- Ascione, F. R. (1993). Children who are cruel to animals: A review of research and implications for developmental psychology. *Anthrozoos*. 6(4). (226-247).
- Akeret, R. U. (1995). *Tales from a Traveling Couch: A Psychotherapist Revisits His Most Memorable Patients*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Allen, C. (1979). *The Sexual Perversions and Abnormalities -- A Study in the Psychology of Paraphilia*. (2nd Ed.). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Alvarez, W. A., & Freinhar, J. P. (1991). A prevalence study of bestiality (zoophilia) in psychiatric in-patients, medical in-patients, and psychiatric staff. *International Journal of Psychosomatics*. 38(1-4). (45-47).
- American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. (4th Ed.). Washington, DC.
- American Psychiatric Association (1987). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. (3rd Rev. Ed.). Washington, DC.
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. (3rd Ed.). Washington, DC.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1968). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. (2nd Ed.). Washington, DC.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1952). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Washington, DC.
- Andriette, B. (1996, March). Laying with beasts. *The Guide*.
- Bagley, H. L. (1969). *The Compulsives*. Atlanta, GA: Pendulum Books, Inc.
- Bagley, H. L. (1968). *The Beast Seekers*. Atlanta, GA: Pendulum Books.
- Barrett, C. (1971). *Women-Animals*. Los Angeles, CA: Echelon Book Publishers, Inc.
- Blake, R. (1972). *Beauty/Beast: A Study of Animal Eroticism; Vol. 2*. (2nd Ed.). San Diego, CA: Greenleaf Classics, Inc.
- Blake, R. (1971). *Beauty/Beast: A Study of Animal Eroticism; Vol. I*. San Diego, CA: Greenleaf Classics, Inc.
- Blake, R. (1965). *Encyclopedia of Abnormal Sex*. North Hollywood, CA: Brandon House.
- Bledsoe, R. J. (1965). *Male Sexual Deviations and Bizarre Practices*. (2nd Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sherbourne Press, Inc.
- Bledsoe, R. J. (1964). *Female Sexual Deviations and Bizarre Practices*. Los Angeles, CA: Sherbourne Press, Inc.
- Bloch, I. (1933). *Anthropological Studies in the Strange Sexual Practices of All Races in All Ages*. New York: Anthropological Press.

- Braun, W. (1967). *The Cruel and the Meek*. New York, NY: Lyle Stuart, Inc.
- Bruno, R. A. (1984). *Laws Governing Sexual Behavior in the United State*. Master's Thesis. San Francisco, CA: The Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality.
- Bryant, C. D. (1982). *Sexual Deviancy and Social Proscription*. New York: Human Sciences Press, Inc.
- Bullough, V. L. (1976). *Sexual Variance in Society and History*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Byrd, M. (2000, December 3). The Joy Of Beasts. *The Independent (The Sunday Review)*. United Kingdom.
- Cameron, P., Cameron, K., & Proctor, K. (1989). Effect of homosexuality upon public health and social order. *Psychological Reports*. *64*(3, Pt 2). (1167-1179).
- Caprio, F. S. (1963). *Variations in Sexual Behavior: A Psychodynamic Study of Deviations in Various Expressions of Sexual Behavior*. (7th Printing). New York, NY: The Citadel Press.
- Cauldwell, D. O. (1968). *Bestiality in Men and Women*. Torrance, CA: Monogram Publication, Inc.
- Cauldwell, D. O. (1948). *Animal Contacts: A Study of the Prevalence, Psychology and Social Significance of a Little Understood Form of Sexual Behavior*. Girard, Kansas: Haldeman-Julius Publications.
- Cerrone, G. H. (1991). Zoophilia in a rural population: Two case studies. *Journal of Rural Community Psychology*. *12*(1). (29-39).
- Chideckel, M. (1938). *Female Sex Perversion — The Sexually Aberrated Woman As She Is*. New York, NY: Eugenics Publishing Company.
- Christy, R. (1967). *The Animal Lovers*. Cleveland, OH: Classics Library.
- Cole, W. G. (1959). *Sex and Love in the Bible*. New York: Association Press.
- Cornog, M., & Perper, T. (1994). Bestiality. *Human Sexuality: An Encyclopedia*. Bullough, V. L., & Bullough, B. (Eds.). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. (60-63).
- Crowell, A. (1967). *Bestiality*. Canoga Park, CA: Viceroy Books.
- Davies, C. (1982). Sexual taboos and social boundaries. *American Journal of Sociology*. *87*(5). (1032-1063).
- Davis, D. L., & Whitten, R. G. (1987). The cross cultural study of human sexuality. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. *16*. (69-98).
- Davis, P. (1954). *Sex Perversion and the Law, Volume One*. (5th Ed.). New York: Mental Health Press.
- D'Emilio, J., & Freedman, E. B. (1988). *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Dekkers, M. (1994). *Dearest Pet: On Bestiality*. (2nd Ed.). Translated by Vincent, P. New York: Verso.
- Dewaraja, R., & Money, J. (1986). Transcultural sexology: Formicophilia, a newly named paraphilia in a young Buddhist male. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*. *12*(2). (139-145).
- Dijkstra, B. (1986). *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-De-Siecle Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Di-Lauro, A., & Rabkin, G. (1976). *Dirty Movies - An Illustrated History of the Stag Film 1915-1970*. New York, NY: Chelsea House.

- Dixon, D., & Dixon, J. K. (1996, April). The realities of studying human/animal sexual behavior. Presentation at *The Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Western Region Conference*. San Diego, CA.
- Donofrio, R. (1996). *Human/Animal Sexual Contact: A Descriptive-Exploratory Study*. Doctoral Dissertation. San Francisco, CA: The Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality.
- Douglas, A. (1992). *The Beast Within*. New York, NY: Avon Books.
- Dubois-Desaulle, G. (1933). *Bestiality: An Historical, Medical, Legal, and Literary Study*. Translated by A. F. N.. New York: The Panurge Press.
- Dumont, A. (1970). *Wealthy Women and Bestiality*. North Hollywood, CA: Barclay House.
- Edenn, J. (1971). *People Who Have Sex with Animals*. N. Hollywood, CA: Barclay House.
- Edwardes, A. (1959). *The Jewel in the Lotus*. Julian Press, Inc.
- Edwardes, A., & Masters, R. E. L. (1977). *The Cradle of Erotica*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Ellison, A. (1970). *Sex Between Humans & Animals: The Psycho-Mythic Meaning of Bestiality*. San Diego, CA: Academy Press.
- Equinox. (1995, June 15). *How To; Equines* [online]. Equinox@worf.netins.net.
- Essen, E. (1969). *The Animalizers*. Los Angeles, CA: Echelon Book Publishers, Inc.
- Evans, E. P. (1987). *The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals*. (2nd Ed.). London: Faber and Faber.
- Ford, C. S., & Beach, F. A. (1951). *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*. Harper & Brothers, Publishers.
- Fox, R. (1994). *The alt.sex.bestiality Frequently Asked Questions* [online]. Redvane@Atheling.Demon.Co.Uk.
- Francoeur, R. T. (1991). *Becoming a Sexual Person*. (2nd Ed.) New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Freud, S. (1963). Three contributions to the theory of sex. (Translated by Brill, A. A.). *The Sexual Revolution: Volume I- Pioneer Writings on Sex*. Kirch, A. (Ed). New York, NY: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.
- Friday, N. (1993). *Women on Top*. (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Pocket Books.
- Friday, N. (1981). *Men in Love*. (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Dell Publishing.
- Friday, N. (1974). *My Secret Garden*. (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Pocket Books.
- Garrison, W. B. (1959). *Strange Bonds Between Animals and Men*. (4th Ed.). New York, NY: ACE Books, Inc.
- Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., & Christenson, C. V. (1965). *Sex Offenders: An Analysis of Types*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers and Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., Medical Books.
- Gebhard, P. H., & Johnson, A. B. (1979). *The Kinsey Data: Marginal Tabulations of the 1938-1963 Interviews Conducted by the Institute for Sex Research*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders Company.
- Greenland, C. (1983). Sex law reform in an international perspective: England and Wales and Canada. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*. 11(4). (309-330).
- Greenwood, M. D. (1963). *Unusual Sex Practices*. Hollywood, CA: The Genell Corp.
- Gregersen, E. (1983). *Sexual Practices: The Story of Human Sexuality*. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Haeberle, E. J. (1978). *The Sex Atlas*. New York, NY: The Seabury Press.

- Hamilton, D. (1981). *Bestial Desires*. South Laguna, CA: Publisher's Consultants.
- Handy, J. (1977). *Girls Who Seduce Dogs*. South Laguna, CA: Publisher's Consultants.
- Harris, E. (1969). *Animals as Sex Partners*. Los Angeles, CA: Ultima House.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1948). *Sexual Anomalies*. New York: Emerson Books, Inc.
- Holmes, R. M. (1991). *Sex Crimes*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Hunt, M. (1974). *Sexual Behavior in the 1970s*. Chicago, IL: Playboy Press.
- Kaplan, L. J. (1989). *Female Perversions*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Karpman, B. (1962). *The Sexual Offender and His Offenses*. (7th Ed.). New York, NY: Julian Press, Inc.
- Kim, P. Y., & Bailey, L. M. (1997). Sidestreets on the information superhighway: paraphilias and sexual variations on the Internet. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*. 22(1). (35-43).
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders Co.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders Company.
- Krafft-Ebing, R. V. (1935). *Psychopathia Sexualis*. (Rev. Ed.). Brooklyn, NY: Physicians and Surgeons Book Company.
- Kullinger, J. L. (1969). *A Very Good Book About Some Very Bad People — The Arrogant Sexuals*. Las Vegas: Nevada: M-T Publishers, Inc.
- Kurrelgyre. (1995). *The Zoophilia Report* [online]. An373492@anon.penet.fi.
- Leal, O. F. (1989). *The Gauchos: Male Culture and Identity in the Pampas*. Doctoral Dissertation. Berkeley: University of California.
- L'Etalon Doux. (1996). *Zoophilia and the Law: History* [online]. An63019@anon.penet.fi.
- Liliequist, J. (1988, September). *Peasants Against Nature -- Crossing the Boundaries Between Man and Animal in 17th and 18th Century Sweden*. Paper presented at the conference "Man and the Animal World," Nijmegen, Holland.
- London, L. S., & Caprio, F. S. (1950). *Sexual Deviations*. Washington, DC: The Linacre Press, Inc.
- Love, B. (1992). *Encyclopedia of Unusual Sex Practices*. Fort Lee, NJ: Barricade Books, Inc.
- Mandetta, A., & Gustaveson, P. (1976). *Abortion to Zoophilia - A Sourcebook of Sexual Facts*. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Population Center.
- Mantegazza, P. (1932). *Anthropological Studies of Sexual Relations of Mankind*. New York: Anthropological Press.
- Marie Claire. (1996, November). How your sex life can land you in jail. (77-78, 80).
- Marshall, B. (1972). *Deviant Sex Practices*. San Diego, CA: Socio Library.
- Masters, R. E. L. (1966). *Sex-Driven People*. Los Angeles, CA: Sherbourne Press, Inc.
- Masters, R. E. L., (1962). *Forbidden Sexual Behavior & Morality*. New York, NY: Lancer Books, Inc.

- Masters, W. H., Johnson, V. E., & Kolodny, R. C. (1995). *Human Sexuality*. (5th Ed.) New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Masters, W. H., Johnson, V. E., & Kolodny, R. C. (1988). *Masters and Johnson on Sex and Human Loving*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Matthews, M. (1994). *The Horseman; Obsessions of a Zoophile*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Maybury, D. O. (1968). *The Secret Perverts*. Los Angeles, CA: Classic Publications.
- McNally, R. J., & Lukach, B. M. (1994). Behavioral treatment of zoophilic exhibitionism. *Journal of Behavioral Therapy and Experiential Psychiatry*. *22*(4). (281-284).
- Menninger, K. A. (1951). Totemic aspects of contemporary attitudes toward animals. *Psychoanalysis and Culture: Essays in Honor of Geza Roheim*. Wilbur, G. B., & Muensterberger, W. (Eds.). New York, NY: International Universities Press.
- Michael, R. T., Gagnon, J. H., Laumann, E. O., & Kolata, G. (1994). *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Miletski, H. (2001). Zoophilia — Implications for Treatment. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*. (26)2. 85-89.
- Miletski, H. (2000, December). Bestiality/Zoophilia — An Exploratory Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Sexology*. 3(4). 149-150.
- Miletski, H. (August 28-October 29, 2000). The secret life of zoophiles — what you don't know about sex with animals [online]. www.ThePosition.com.
- Miletski, H. (1995). *Mother-Son Incest: The Unthinkable Broken Taboo: An Overview of Findings*. Brandon, VT: The Safer Society Press.
- Moll, A. (1933). *Libido Sexualis*. New York, NY: American Ethnological Press.
- Money J., & Pranzarone, G. F. (1993). Development of paraphilia in childhood and adolescence. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*. *2*(3). (463-475).
- Money, J. (1981). Paraphilias: Phyletic origins of erotosexual dysfunction. *International Journal of Mental Health*. *10*(2-3). (75-109).
- Money, J. (1986) *Lovemaps*. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc.
- Montclair, R. (1997). Tails of bestiality. *Black Book Magazine*.
- Monter, E. W. (1981). Sodomy and heresy in early modern Switzerland. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 6(1-2). (41-55).
- Morris, P. (1988). Sodomy and male honor: The case of Somerset, 1740-1850. *Journal of Homosexuality*. *16*(1-2). (383-406).
- Motoyama, S. (June 19, 1996). Zipless fuckology. *Baltimore City Paper*. (15-16).
- Nagaraja, J. (1983). Sexual problems in adolescence. *Child Psychiatry Quarterly*. *16*(1). (9-18).
- Neret, G. (1994). *Erotica Universalis*. Koln, Germany: Benedikt Taschen.
- Neufeldt, V., & Guralnik, D. B. (Eds.). (1989). *Webster's New World Dictionary: Third College Edition*. New York, NY: Webster's New World Dictionaries.
- Niemoeller, A. F. (1946). *Bestiality and the Law: A Resume of the Law and Punishments for Bestiality with Typical Cases from Fifteenth Century to the Present*. Girard, Kansas: Haldeman-Julius Publications.

- Niemoeller, A. F. (1946b). *Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times*. Girard, Kansas: Haldeman-Julius Publications.
- Penyak, L. M. (1993). *Criminal Sexuality in Central Mexico, 1750-1850*. Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Connecticut.
- Peretti, P. O., & Rowan, M. (1983). Zoophilia: factors related to its sustained practice. *Panminerva Medica*. 25. (127-131).
- Queen, C. (1997, January). Talking with animals. *Black Sheets*. 10. (14-15).
- Ramsis, J. A. (1969). *Casebook: Animal Love*. Pendulum Books, Inc.
- Rappaport, E. A. (1968). Zoophily and zoerasty. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. 37. (565-87).
- Ratliff, D. H. (1976). *Minor Sexual Deviance: Diagnosis and Pastoral Treatment*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publication Co.
- Richard, D. (2001). Forbidden love: viewing the question of animal love from two sides. *Contemporary Sexuality*. 35(10). (1, 4-7).
- Rosenberger, J. R. (1968). *Bestiality*. Los Angeles, CA: Medco Books.
- Rosenfeld, J. R. (1967). *The Animal Lovers*. Atlanta, GA: Pendulum Books.
- Russell, L. (1971). *Perversions*. Greenleaf Classics, Inc.
- Salisbury, J. E. (1994). *The Beast Within -- Animals in the Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge.
- Shenken, L. I. (1964). Some clinical and psychopathological aspects of bestiality. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. 139(2). (137-142).
- Shepherd, R. (1996). *Fur of the Beast: The Life and Loves of a Dog Lover*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Somers, J. E. (1966). *Sick Sex*. Hollywood, CA: Venice Publishing Corporation.
- Sparks, J. (1977). *The Sexual Connection — Mating the Wild Way*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Stasya. (1996). *Stasya's Home Page* [online]. [Http://www.av.qnet.com~stasya](http://www.av.qnet.com~stasya).
- Stayton, W. R. (1994). Sodomy. *Human Sexuality: An Encyclopedia*. Bullough, V. L., & Bullough, B. (Eds.). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. (568).
- Steirmann, M. (1966). *The Bizarre Sex*. N. Hollywood, CA: Victory Books.
- Stekel, W. (1952). *Patterns of Psychosexual Infantilism*. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.
- Stoller, R. J. (1975). *Perversion: The Erotic Form of Hatred*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Stone, J. (1992). A psychoanalytic bestiary: The wolff woman, the leopard, and the siren. *American Imago*. 49(1). (117-152).
- Storr, A. (1964). *Sexual Deviation*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.
- Story, M. D. (1982). A comparison of university student experience with various sexual outlets in 1974 and 1980. *Adolescence*. 17(68). (737-747).
- Sword, R. O. (1978). Sexual deviancy. *Human Sexuality for Health Professionals*. Barnard, M. U., Clancy, B. J., & Krantz, K. E. (Eds.). Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company. (191-211).
- Tanka, S. (1995). *Shuunka's View of Zoophilia and Zoosexuality* [online]. Shuunka@netcom.com.

- Taylor, T. (1996). *The Prehistory of Sex*. New York: Bantam Books.
- The American Association for Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists. (1996, November). *Contemporary Sexuality*. 30(11).
- The Humane Society of the United States. (1998). *The First Strike Campaign: Animal Sexual Abuse Information Packet*. Washington, DC.
- The Institute for Advanced Study of Human Sexuality. (1984) *The Standard Operating Procedures Handbook for Faculty and Students*. San Francisco, CA.
- The Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. (1995, April 1). *Code Of Federal Regulations (21 CFR 50.20 & 50.25)*. (Rev. Ed.). Washington, DC.
- The Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality. (1996). *Sexual Science*. 37(2). (5).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Summer, Fall 1996/Winter 1997). (14).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Winter 1995/96, Spring 1996). (13).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Spring, Summer, Fall 1995). (12).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Fall/Winter 1994/1995). (11).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Spring/Summer 1994). (10).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (1993). (9).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Fall 1992d). (8).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Summer 1992c). (7).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Spring 1992b). (6).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Winter 1992). (5).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Spring 1991b). (2).
- The Wild Animal Revue*. (Winter 1991). (1).
- Tannahill, R. (1992). *Sex in History*. (Rev. Ed.). Scarborough House/Publishers.
- Trimble, J. F. (1969). *Female Bestiality*. Torrance, CA: Monogram Publications, Inc.
- Ullerstam, L. (1966). *The Erotic Minorities*. (Originally published in Sweden in 1964). New York, NY: Grove Press, Inc.
- Waine, W. W. (1968). *Canine Sexualis*. San Diego, CA: Publisher's Export Co., Inc.
- Zillmann, D., Bryant, J., & Carveth, R. A. (1981). The effect of erotica featuring sadomasochism and bestiality on motivated intermale aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 7(1). (153-159).

APPENDIX I

IN THE CHAT ROOM

The following are excerpts of what transpired in the chat room, on that cold November night in 1995, when I logged on the Internet for the first time in my life, and into a chat room where a whole crowd of zoos was waiting to speak with me. I changed all the names, even though the people who logged on had their Internet names. Most of their Internet names consisted of animals or had something to do with animals. Trying to preserve the atmosphere that I found myself in, I gave them similar names. If by any chance, I used someone else's Internet name, that was not intentional.

Tammy shouts — Can I have everyone's attention in the forest please?

Tammy shouts — I'm going to be moderating tonight

Active says — Moderate away, Tam :)

Tammy shouts — Those of you planning on attending the thing with Hani, please come down here

Tammy says — Okay. Beverly has asked me to moderate tonight. The purpose for this visit, as I understand, is for Hani to tell us about her research and then for her to answer questions.

Black says — what kind of research?

Tammy says — I'm going to find that out along with you all

Active says — So she's not looking for information from us?

Strong says — Not at this time.

Tammy says — this is not going to be a one on one thing, not at this time.

Active says — Interesting.

Tammy says — but she would like to have contact with some people here.

Satyr says — This is a meeting to allow us to meet her and understand what she is trying to do/research.

Tammy shouts — Can I have everyone's attention in the forest please?

Doggie says — No!

Active listens.

Kevin wows at Doggie

Tammy pokes Doggie :)

Mike nods

Whitedog says — It's only a little report, Active. Nothing's going to be published.

Active says — Oh?

Tussle walks in

SIGN ON — HANI MILETSKI, MSW

Active says — Hi Hani!

Satyr says — Heya Hani :)

Thrill lifts Kevin up... “can you see?”

Tammy says — Hi Hani

Jim tacklehugs Hani

Black says — Hi Hani

Mike says — hello then :)

Alex says — hi Hani

Foxi says — Hi Hani

Tussle spyhops

Satyr says — Welcome to the Forest, or “total chaos” as it sometimes is ;)

Troy says — hi all

Tammy says — I am explaining what’s going on to everyone. My name is Tammy, and I will try to moderate tonight. I would like to use the same method as we did for other meetings... talking one at a time, and if you wish to talk, use a * to indicate that.

Cocco says — hello everyone

Tammy says — Kevin, can you keep track of who is next to talk for me?

Kevin says — okay, let me get some scritch paper

Urge splashes Race Horse

Jim thwapples Race Horse gently

Axiom says — Hi Active

Redcow sits and moos

Craig walks in

Prince appears from nowhere!

Mic walks in

Littlehorse walks in

Full walks in

Mic grabs the couch

Zoro walks in

Mike sits next to Mic

Foxi says — eekk, what a crowded hallway!

Alex snags a spot on the couch

Foxi sits by Mic

Whitedog lays on Mike and Mic :)

Beverly says — okay, people, Hani isn’t used to the net, so don’t spam her, please.

Full eats outa his feeder

Word walks in

Active nods

Redcow lies down and ruminates...

Jim finds a piece of carpet to lay on, and pulls Race Horse down on top of him, skritchng his tummy

Active grins

Dolphin reads the message board.

Race Horse yeeeps and stretches on Jim, "Mmmmmmm!"

Tammy says — While Hani is talking, please do not interrupt.

Hani says — Hi everybody. Just wanted to let you know that it's my first time on the net and I'm very slow at this, so please be patient. Do you have any questions for me?

Black says — hi Hani

Mike says — hello Hani :)

Active says — Hi Hani

Holland bids you all good morning!

Foxi says — Hi Hani

Dolphin says — Hello Hani!

Tammy says — Welcome Hani

Mic says — hi Hani

Doggie says — hi Hani. We spoke on der phone

Prince says — howdy!

Alex says — greetings Hani

Satyr bows in greeting to Hani

Jim waves

Littlehorse says — hi, we spoke

Trouble clicks hello! :)

Race Horse bows, "Hello Hani. I'm a complete stranger."

Whitedog waves to Hani. Then sits and pays attention.

Littlehorse says — *

Sheep knocks on the door

Holland says — Hani, what is the purpose of your study? What do you hope to get out of it?

Crocodile appears from nowhere!

Hani says — Basically, I want to get all the info. I can get about bestiality and zoophilia, and more specifically if this is a form of sexual orientation.

Active says — *

Jim says — *

Dog appears from nowhere!

Wolfie arrives in a blinding flash!

Kevin says — Littlehorse is next

Satyr says — *

Doggie says — *

Littlehorse says — okay, could you tell us where besides here you find sources of information? Or put differently, are all your sources Internet typos of one sort or another?

Prince says — *

Horselover walks in

Lamb walks in

Hani says — I am hoping to get all of your cooperation in that, so that you tell others who are not connected to the net about me.

Littlehorse says — okay, thanks

Kevin says — Active is next

Active says — I don't think there's any question that zooness is a sexual orientation, like being hetero or gay or bi.

Race Horse says — *

Dolphin is ignoring everyone.

Hani says — but I don't think other people know that (I don't know that either, but I hope to find out)

Dolphin is now listening

Active nods and says — That's part of the problem: they think we do it because we can't get a human:)

Hani says — right. I get a lot of that from people who have no idea about the subject.

Tammy says — *

Burro walks in

Mike says — *

Kevin says — Jim is next

Jim says — I just wanted to make a clarification; when you say "sexual orientation" you are saying in contrast to a kink, or sexual behavior, like bondage/frottage/etc... So, in your research you are trying to determine if zoophilia is in fact an orientation and not just a kink?

Hani says — Yes, a sexual orientation like homosexuality.

Pony says — *

Littlehorse says — *

Mic says — *

Kevin says — Satyr is next

Satyr takes a deep breath and says — I think we would all like to get a little background as to why you are gathering this information. What is already out there on the subject, and what do you hope to contribute to the psychological community by doing this study? I know you're planning on putting together a rather lengthy questionnaire for those who choose to partake in the study. Do you have any ideas as to what its content will be?

Satyr yields the floor

Hani says — I know there is not a lot out there, and that's why I want to do something about it. The questionnaire will probably be long, and will include questions about your sex life, as well as questions about your life in general, such as level of education, age, etc. I will have questions with different options for you to choose from, and I will also allow you to elaborate on your feelings, thoughts, and experiences, so that I can get more info.

Satyr nods and thanks Hani

Star walks in

Active says — *

Moo arrives in a blinding flash!

Wolf walks in

Prince says — that was my question. I was curious as to when you...oops, sorry...

Kevin tickles Prince ;)

Fortune walks in

Kevin nods to Doggie and says — Doggie is next

Doggie says — thanks. Are the study results to be widely published in some form? Might it mean a change of term from zoophilie to something like zoosexual which indicates an orientation rather than a mental illness? Yields der floor.

Hani says — I don't know. Haven't thought about it. I am hoping to have enough info. to be able to publish it in a book.

Doggie says — thank you.

Kevin tickles Doggie — limit your questions silly ;)

Breath knocks on the door and walks in

Fortune curls up quietly on the floor...

Hani says — next question

Redcow says — *

Kevin hands the microphone to Prince

Prince says — I'm a professor of photography. I will be happy to do the illustrations, Hani *laughs*... seriously, your form sounds interesting. When will they be available and how do we get them? Thank you.

Hani says — good question. It will probably be ready, hopefully, before the summer. I need you to call me at (202) 659-4938, to tell me how can I send it to you, since I have no regular access to the net. If anyone is long distance, you can call me, and I'll call you right back, so don't worry about the charges. Even if you are in a different country.

Black says — *

Holland says — *

Active says — *

Word reads the mail

Kevin says — Race Horse, your turn

Race Horse walks up to the mic and baps it on his head. “Ow.”

Tammy smiles

Fortune smiles

Hani says — Hani too (I’m starting to get the hang of this).

Two knocks on the door

Foxi perks her ears

Race Horse says — insomuch as zoophilia being considered a sexuality, I do agree that it is. But I think it is vastly different from homosexuality on a few points. In my experience, the majority of zoophiles or zoosexuals, whatever you call it, had mostly environmental factors that made them that way, for the most part. I imagine all of us have an “affinity” toward animals. But by and large, I suspect most here grew up spending much time alone, and turned to non-humans as a means of support and friendship. To many of us, it seems only logical to take that a step further and extend those relationships into the areas of intimacy. More and more it seems homosexuality is becoming linked to genetics. This may be true of zoophiles to a degree, but only marginally.

Hani says — everything is possible. I hope to find out more about it in the future.

Race Horse says — a person may have had an abusive family, for instance, and formed a relationship with his dog.

Hani says — right! That’s why this will be one of my questions in the questionnaire.

Fortune nods

Race Horse says — I think you’ll find scenarios like this abundant when you talk to the rest of us.

Tammy says — thanks Race Horse

Race Horse is finished, now that his face is blue.

Spike walks in

Black applauds

Crocodile says — *

Kevin passes the mic to Lamb

Lamb says — is your research going to look at the zoophiles’ other relationships as well? I’m currently in a relationship and have told her about my interests. It worked out well for me, but others were not so lucky.

Hani says — yes. I’m happy for you. It must have been difficult for you.

Moo smiles

Tammy says — Hani, many of my friends here are very concerned about privacy. What kind of guarantees do they have this will all be in confidence? And can we work together to set up something

so that their privacy can be maintained? I mean like a go between... or something. Oh, one more... are you interested in zoo-friendly's?

Hani says — Well, the questionnaire is anonymous. I am not going to include any personal info. on you in my study. All I need is a name and an address to send it to you. When you send it back you don't have to put your address on. (Beverly, who is sitting next to me, is telling me that Tammy is not a zoo, but a "zoo-friendly." She likes to hang out with zoos and help them when they need her help). The people who qualify for my study are those who have had sexual contact with animals! Sorry.

Tammy says — you understand, Hani, that many people here can be arrested for this. Maybe the form can be made available electronically on one of the zoo sites?

Hani says — the problem with that is that I will have no idea who was the respondent, and I can get people who just played a trick on me.

Tammy says — I could be an intermediary, if people trusted me...

Doggie says — *

Moo says — *

Whitedog says — *

Two says — *

Full says — *

Alex grins

Active says — *

Ron says — *

Woof goes to the forest

Goat goes to the forest

Kevin says — okay, the list is over 17 long now. Trouble is next, but Black has to leave soon.

Tammy says — Black...

Black says — is the research you do here going to be used as part of any graduate work? And for what specific purpose?

Hani says — I am a doctoral student in human sexuality. This is my dissertation research.

Black waves bye to everyone and says — okay, thank you

Hani says — bye

Dogman arrives in a blinding flash!

GW appears from nowhere!

Mike says — what prompted you to do this research?

Hani says — I am a psychotherapist in my profession. I have a client who is a zoo, and I was trying to get some literature for him, but found almost nothing. So I figured that this subject needs to be researched and published.

Mike smiles. "Thank you" :)

Wildlife walks in.

Trouble says — two parts: 1. What specific research question do you want to answer, or are you just gathering general information about zoophilia?

Hani says — generally, both. Specifically, is there such a thing as a sexual orientation toward animals?

Trouble says — 2. How do you plan to address the obvious bias that *we* as power computer users, are just a subset of the total zoo community?

Hani says — I know, that's a problem. I will have to address that in my dissertation as a limitation of my study. But, I am hoping to get people who are not in the net as well.

Trouble hopes so too and yields the floor

Sunshine walks in

Pony says — is it your goal to attempt an origin theory on zoophilia, or the coping mechanisms that various zoos have developed in order to function within society?

Hani says — I guess both. It will be great if I can get the answers to all of that.

Pony says — can I squeeze in another one?

Hani says — a ha

Pony says — what are your current beliefs about the origin of zoophilia: biological, psychological, or sociological?

Hani says — currently I have no actual beliefs. I don't want to get into this research project with biases.

Moo nods

Lamb says — good answer :)

Hani says — thanks. Who's next?

Mic says — sorry, Hani, I'm confused. So far, it seems that you are only gathering information. You have not formulated any specific question which you are trying to answer. I do not think that I want to be involved in just an information gathering without knowing to what end the information I give will be used.

Hani says — basically yes. But, I said earlier that I am trying to find out if there is a sexual orientation toward animals.

Mic says — of course there is, or we wouldn't be here :)

Hani says — I believe that whatever I find will be important and worthwhile, since most people have no clue about this subject, including psychotherapists who are supposed to help people deal with that.

Mic says — help people deal with what? What do you mean by "deal with it."?

Tammy says — Mic, there are many issues to be "dealt with." I'm sure Hani is not saying it is wrong

Mic says — sorry, but I do not feel like I am getting solid answers

GW nods in agreement

Hani says — with their struggles. I know that a lot of you thought at one point or another that you are the only one, and that something is wrong with you, and there was no one to talk to about it, and nothing to read... So I think it is important to get people to know more, and not be judgmental.

Mic says — okay. Then that would be a purpose that I would be willing to participate in. I yield.

Hani says — great. Thanks!

Tammy says — just an FYI, I've discussed zoophilia with my therapist, she knew nothing about it.

Mike says — *

Blackhorse walks in

Active says — okay, here it goes, this is going to be long. First, I think I speak for the majority when I say I do not approve of asking zoos for a mailing address, under any circumstances, even if you don't connect the answers to the individual respondents. Sorry to come so hard, but using snail mail is extremely dangerous for items of a sexual nature, especially where that nature is illegal in some areas. Sending bestiality information, even a survey response, through the mail can be a Federal offense, so everyone who replies may become a criminal. I second Tam's recommendation that you make the form available at one or more of the more popular zoo web pages. This should make distribution easy and very safe. Those of us with zoo friends not connected to the net can pass the info along by ourselves and relay it via email through a trusted intermediary. As for people who play a trick on you, that'll happen no matter what method you use for gathering the data. Masters and Johnson faced it, and so did Margaret Mead. It simply goes with the territory. Sex is prone to pranksters. And for the record, I never thought there was anything "wrong" with me :) Finally, in more mundane matters, have you read "the Horseman" by Mark Matthews? I haven't read it myself, but it is highly recommended.

Race Horse grabs a bucket of popcorn

Hani says — well, first, please don't write so much at one time... I'm a slow reader :)

Active apologizes — I'm leaving soon, so I threw up my queue all at once :)

Hani says — I read the book, and even talked to the author. This was one of the things that inspired me to do the research. I already have about 20 people who have given me their addresses. I know it is dangerous, but if you don't put your address, the police can only arrest me.

Active says — but if someone wanted to compile a list of zoos, this is how one would do it. In order to receive a form, one must send out an address, so the list compiler knows at least you're a zoo.

Hani says — I highly doubt that anyone is going to open the mail. Also, I send you the questionnaire, and when you send it back, no one knows who it is from. I promise not to give out and not to use the list I have in any form or shape. I don't know what else I can tell you.

Beverly says — if she was to give out personal information after gathering it into a list, she would be censured by her university. No reputable researcher gives out personal information on subjects

Mike nods

Hani says — and I will also lose my credentials as a psychotherapist

Breath says — and our name would be prisoner 9243b

Blackhorse says — hehe

Active turns on his total paranoia mode — if you are really a researcher and not a Fed. Sorry, it had to be said. Paranoia mode off :(

Foxi grins

Active now yields the floor. Promise :)

Kevin tickles Active, mainly cause it's fun ;)

Beverly says — I look around Hani's room, at the literature and documentation already gathered on the subject, and wonder if Hani could really be a Fed. I don't think so.

Hani says — thanks.

World walks in

Doggie says — *

Foxi says — *

Deer walks in

Copy arrives in a blinding flash!

Full says — *

Redcow says — are the questionnaires going to be given to non-zoos for comparison? How are you going to compare the question results?

Hani says — that's a very good idea. I'll have to talk to my committee members about it.

Redcow says — Will it be qualitative or quantitative? Will questions be leading? Will you use open or closed answers?

Hani says — both. I'll have open-ended questions as well as multiple choice ones.

Redcow says — will you take into account the socio-economic factors? And even geographical location? Age? Sex? Etc.

Hani says — yes, all of the above.

Redcow says — how will you present them to the subject?

Hani says — what do you mean?

Redcow says — well, do you ask your subject about economics, or do you use census data?

Hani says — I ask. Probably will give a few options to choose from.

Redcow says — sorry, you seem to have misunderstood. Are you going to find further data about the subject from previous surveys, using say their address to find their socio-economic class. Also, have you had any papers published in journals etc. before?

Hani says — I will have to look at other studies, but I don't think anyone has studied it before, at least as far as I know. I will only use the info you give me. Im not going to spy on you in any other way. I don't even ask questions on the phone when people call me. And I have not yet published anything, but my master's thesis is going to be published probably in January.

Redcow says — 2 last questions. Very short, are you going to look at the species of animal the subject likes, and the age at which they started?

Hani says — Sure. That's very important info.

Tammy says — good questions Redcow

Jim says — there is only a tiny amount of literature out there on the topic, and what there is of it is largely outdated... so Hani has a job cut out for her, due to the scarcity of prior work. I'm not sure she's even gotten a chance to formulate the kinds of questions she wants to ask. This is going to be a very big synthesis.

Ball walks in

Kevin notes — the list: Holland, Breath, Doggie, Moo, Two, Full, Ron, Mini, Kevin, Mike, Foxi, Sunshine, so you can all know who is in front of you and get ready :-)

Holland stands up clears his throat and says — just want to know, in the UK, are you going to snail mail the questionnaires over to us? Also, what sort of time do you accept phone calls bearing in mind our time difference. Is the questionnaire going to be based in a sexual context? Or will there be an emotional content as well. For instance, to me, sex is not the only consideration. It covers the whole spectrum just like in human relationships.

Hani says — yes, I'll have to send it by regular mail. I am going to ask about the emotional aspect as well, cause this is part of it, as far as I understand.

Copy nods

Holland says — my overriding concern is my horse's happiness, not my own. I'll do anything for that.

Moo smiles at Holland

Mike nods enthusiastically

Hani says — there's 6 hours difference between DC and UK. So just calculate the time, whenever you want

Holland says — Hani, and you'll call back to the UK??? That's expensive.

Hani says — sure I'll call!!!

Mike says — cool :)

Tammy says — okay Holland?

Holland says — umm... I think those bits about the emotional aspects and such was it.

Tammy says — Breath is next

Kevin suddenly notes the absence of a microphone in his hand!! Giggles

Tammy says — oops! Did I mess up?

Tammy sits back and lets Kevin do his job — sorry :)

Breath says — the thing that worries me the most is the anonymity. Let me get this right, you want me to give my entire address to a complete stranger about a subject which is completely illegal in the UK and carries a maximum penalty of life sentence for an unclear advantage?

Hani says — I know I am asking you to trust me and you don't even know me. I'm asking a lot, but what else can I do?

Tammy says — you are with two people we do trust, Hani. I'm sure we can figure something out.

Hani says — thanks Tammy

Breath says — make the form available via a web site or send it out via... What do you hope to actually achieve with this whole thing? Who will be able to see it? The general public? The psychiatry community? Or just a few professors in a small university?

Hani says — currently I am not connected to the net, so that's a problem. We'll see. I'm hoping to publish it as a book, and have in mind to make presentations to professionals in various conferences.

Littlehorse is satisfied and will answer the questionnaire when it appears

Hani says — thank you Littlehorse

Breath is afraid he's not going to touch this. Sounds too fishy to him

Hani says — why Breath?

Tammy says — everyone is entitled to their own opinion

Hani says — true, but still, I need as many people as I can get. The more people I have, the more credible the study will be

Breath says — exactly, and my opinion is that I am not going to give my home address to anyone I don't know real well, or without a good reason. Who's to say that Hani is not someone collecting addresses of zoos for various reasons. Ours is not a simple life. People would see us persecuted at every chance. And why the curiosity over this subject in particular? Is there a reason?

Hani says — I understand you. That's why I want you to call me, so you may get to know me better. I explained earlier.

Tammy says — she has gone over that. I'm recording and will make the file available

Breath says — sorry, I didn't see that

Hani says — that's okay. Feel free to call me

Breath says — why don't you just conduct some interviews here? Lock a room and interview people. Anonymous and easy.

Tammy says — she has no net access

Breath says — how is she here now then?

Beverly says — we came over to her house with a laptop and signed on through our account

Breath sits down and listens

Breath says — Beverly is with her in real life?

Tammy says — yes

Breath didn't know this fact :)

Beverly says — we are here, it's our computer, and we trust Hani

Breath would have been a lot more chilled out had someone told him this

Hani says — that's okay. I'm glad you are with us

Race Horse says — I'm sorry Hani. I don't think I can trust you. I think you're an alien from Dimension X

Tammy says — let's let Hani continue with her answers

Doggie says — I believe Hani is a medical professional bound by rules of ethics/client confidentiality. Those concerned about their address should use a P.O. Box, or not participate, perhaps. Email/second party and web pages can be meddled with. Test is not illegal to mail, or "The Horseman" could never be mailed. Overseas mail coming in to the US is subject to search at customs.

Moo waits patiently for his turn

Kevin passes the mic over

Moo says — first of all I'm hoping you'll realize how important it is for you to make this available to as many as possible, through whatever means possible. We treasure our anonymity dearly and we must protect ourselves foremost. I'm wondering how many different ways you're going to cross-reference the data. There are a lot of demographics to consider: those who are straight/bi/gay with people. Those who aren't involved with people at all, those who are married/divorced/re-married, race,

religion, present age, “starting” age, animal of choice, etc. Are you just going to look for commonalities and then go from there? I’m just wondering if you’ll put more importance behind the statistics or from personal anecdotes? Cause I believe that you may learn a lot more from talking to us as opposed to just getting us to list off answers to questions.

Mike nods

GW nods too and says — good question Moo

Hani says — I am hoping to get qualitative as well as quantitative info, and the questionnaire will probably be long

Moo says — alright. Willya accept a collect call on Monday? :)

Hani says — yes! Please!

Moo smiles and gets his dialing finger ready ;)

Horselover says — *

Two says — I would like to add to the “orientation” question first. Yes, I think there is definitely a sexual orientation toward animals, be it genetic or learned. I am as much aroused by my mares as my wife, and sometimes will drift off and remember past encounters. Second, one thing at least for me is the lack of false pretenses with all animals. Face it, humans will lie. If you do something an animal doesn’t like, you will know, as you will know if you do something they like. I have spent many hours just scratching an itchy spot and have seen a look that means “I really like that.”

Tammy says — Two, do you have a question Hani can answer for you?

Two says — uh, guess not.

Tammy smiles at Two and says — you will have time to chat with Hani on the phone.

Active says — *

Copy says — *

Ron, looking at the big picture, wonders if Hani’s research is aimed at pulling zoophilia back into the realm of normal sexuality, where it was once before, or further define it as a perversion that does not produce children to further the ideology of our society.

Hani says — I have no such aim. My intention is to provide objective data so that people will know about zoophilia and maybe understand it better. I will have to analyze all the findings and put it in some form in my dissertation, and afterwards in my future book. I am still in the beginning process of my work, so it will take some time, and a lot of work...

Race Horse expects a full report, with cover and illustrations on his desk tomorrow.

Fur appears from nowhere!

Pope appears from nowhere!

Doggie says — *

Kevin sits on Race Horse

Pope laughs

Kevin smiles

Race Horse winks at Hani

Mini says — Hani, please forgive if I sound stern in what I say, no disrespect is intended, and please excuse my slow typing. First, I saw you mention “committee.” Will these people be privy to the personal info that I give you, should I decide to do so? How many others, besides yourself will be privy to that info?

Hani says — no one. Just me

Mini says — I do not mean to sound paranoid, but...

Hani says — I understand

Race Horse says — Hani no esta los federales

Mini says — these people here are my family. I love them all, and am fearful of this whole thing. But Beverly seems to trust you, and so will I.

Mike smiles

Hani says — thanks

Mini says — but please understand my and others fear

Hani says — I do

Mini says — thank you. Sorry for rehashing an old question

Hani says — that’s fine :)

Tammy hugs Mini tightly

Race Horse huggles Mini too

Ron grins and hugs Mini tightly

Strong says — *

Kevin says — at the start you mentioned that the reason you are doing this at all is a result of a patient of yours. I know that you can’t tell us who the patient is, but I might be so bold as to say that there are many folks here who have found “acceptance” here, online. It might be a thought for your patient to “come here” sometimes. They could, of course, be anonymous unless they chose to say anything about it.

Hani says — I know. I’ll keep that in mind

Race Horse notes that the “acceptance” found here is a double edged sword. It ain’t always a bouquet of roses.

Kevin says — that’s it. And I’ll be calling you sometime

Hani says — thanks

Sunshine says — would you send several questionnaires to New Zealand, as I know some here that would fill them out?

Hani says — yes, but I would like to talk to you on the phone first. Call me and I’ll call you back.

Horselover says — I’ve been discussing mailing the questionnaire with an Australian Customs Officer, and in her off-duty opinion, it’s unlikely that any harm would come to *me* sending the response. But text on bestiality, with details, is a prohibited import everywhere she knows about.

Hani says — I know, I’m the only one at risk

Horselover says — so, effectively, Hani, I would be getting *you* to break the law by answering your questions in detail. How are you going to deal with it in the small chance that someone does check the mail.

Jim says — but it could be reasonably argued that it's not erotica

Pope wonders if the academic nature of the material wouldn't protect it

Hani says — Jim and Pope are probably right, hopefully :)

Polo appears from nowhere!

Bobby walks in

Kevin nuzzles Bobby

Copy says — did anyone ask if repression because of religion becomes involved for the person, and the ramifications of that and on altered social behavior for not being who you are and what outlets does this altered behavior take? Is this going to be contained in the report?

Hani says — these are all good ideas for questions. Thank you.

Copy says — Also, are you going to include, for those of us who are married who's spouses know about their zoo life, any questions for them?

Hani says — no, but I'll ask you about it.

Copy says — okay. That was it for me.

Mustang appears from nowhere!

Doggie says — they consider us to be dog rapists who should be castrated and jailed. Bringing out *too* much info publically may make them, the Humane Society, and animal rights groups more aware of an *organized network* with possibly bad consequences. What is Hani's view on this additional exposure risk?

Hani says — that's a good one. Let me think...

Doggie says — people laugh at sex with horses, but get mighty pissed if they think a dog is being abused.

Hani says — there are always risks, but I hope that my study will show people the humane side of it, and that it's not abuse.

Strong says — neither Hani nor I nor anyone else pretends there isn't some risk here, possibly serious risk. But it is worth noting that I don't believe the risk lies with Hani. I pride myself on being an accomplished sniffer of fakes and Feds, and I'm betting she's neither. Nevertheless, as you all seem to know, you don't have 100% protection. Yes, you will take an enormous risk receiving the questionnaire, and I don't think anyone would hold it against you if you chose to abstain from the survey for that very reason. There is more, though. This is also, to some extent, about sacrifice. In taking this risk, you would be contributing to the first ever serious research about zoophilia.

Active says — people who don't know about places like alt.sex.bestiality and the Forest are probably worse off than any of us.

Strong says — this is your chance to make a difference. There is, of course, the distinct possibility that Hani will be an unwilling and/or unwitting participant in an FBI operation. They can tap her phones, search her files, raid her records, on a whim. They can decide to use the information to arrest us all, or just keep it for... a rainy day, as it were. They can, of course, do the same to each of us should they want to badly enough. Of course, I don't know what would happen to non-Americans, but I would expect it would be similar in Canada, and possibly the UK. However, that risk has always been present

Jim says — I don't think the Feds are in the habit of raiding university psych labs.

Bobby says — *

Active says — *

Kevin passes the mic over to Bobby

Bobby says — quite a few questions related to professional things. First, do you have a pre-approved committee? You cannot conduct psychological research or experimentation without committee approval. It is illegal. Without this approval, your doctoral thesis will be disqualified.

Hani says — I already have an approval

Bobby says — is the institution accredited, and if so, by who?

Beverly says — Hani is looking up the accreditation and will be right back. Good questions!

Tammy says — how is she holding up?

Beverly says — I'm more tired than she is. She's excited about the people being willing to help and this whole new medium.

Hani says — I'm back. The school has full educational approval as a California degree granting institution by the California State Department of Education, Private Post-secondary Education Division

Bobby says — okay. Which research model are you using? And what statistical method of tabulation?

Hani says — It's too soon. I don't know yet. I am still gathering data and trying to find out how many people will volunteer for the research. I have professional researchers who volunteered to help me with it.

Bobby says — is not trying to give you the 5th degree, just verifying validity :)

Hani says — I appreciate it

Active says — Hani, would you consider a chi-square analysis of 90% to be statistically significant?

Hani says — I have to go back to my statistics books for that one :)

Active says — okay :)

Tammy smiles and says — I think this is it

GW says — *

Hani says — GW, what was your question?

GW — I was just wondering if there was anyway I could talk to you outside the usual business hours, as I work and I can't talk at work. We are very much monitored.

Hani says — yes, call me and just leave your number and a good time to catch you, and I'll call you.

GW says — thanks, I appreciate it. And thanks for taking the time to answer one last question

Hani says — thank you.

Bobby huggles Hani for her patience

Whitedog grabs Tammy and does the tango!

Hani says — and I want to thank everyone for their cooperation and, maybe even, trust in me

Active says — you're welcome, Hani

GW says — you're welcome, and come back and visit again

Pope applauds Hani and especially the Wizards for their excellent crowd control

Mike says — I would like to thank Hani for doing this research project and wish her good luck

Whitedog says — you'll most likely be getting a call from me, Hani

Active agrees with Whitedog

GW says — also thanks to Beverly for giving Hani and us an opportunity to talk

Mike says — I'll be calling too

GW says — Tammy, how long did the meeting run approximately?

Tammy says — about 250 minutes :)

Bobby says — wow!

Hani says — wow!

GW offers fresh popcorn to everyone

Mike grabs a donut and fires up the espresso machine

Hani says — good night everyone. We are going to sleep :)

APPENDIX II

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX III

WHAT ELSE DID THE PARTICIPANTS WANT TO SHARE?

The last question in the questionnaire asked “Is there anything else you would like to share?” Not everyone responded to this question. By the time the participants arrived at question 350 on page 23, they must have been tired of answering so many questions and relating their whole life story. Nevertheless, those who did respond to this question managed to fill more than 50 typed pages collectively. Some of what they wanted to share you already read in previous sections. This section is devoted to all the other comments made by the participants which did not get to be included anywhere else in this book.

Most participants thanked me for doing this study and allowing them to participate, and wished me luck. For example —

— “I just wanted to take a minute to thank you for allowing me to participate in your study. I wish you much luck. Thanks again.”

— “Thank you for the chance to share my information.”

— “I am very glad that you are doing this study. Perhaps it will help shed some light on how zoophiles really are as people. Too many bad things are connected with us, and that really needs changing.”

— “Glad you are doing this. Anxious to see what you come up with, and hope it has a positive impact.”

— “I wish you good luck on your dissertation. I hope you will turn this questionnaire into a book to help shed some light on a misunderstood life-style. Zoos are regular people who just happen to prefer animal partners. Thanks Hani.”

— “Thank you very very much for allowing me to talk about this. I can’t express how it’s felt writing about myself to someone else in a non-judgmental forum. As I went to mail the questionnaire, I started thinking about how I felt after doing it. Relieved is almost right but not exactly. The feeling of being able to express myself to another without any fears is incredible. There are so many people I’m friends with and respect and who even respect me... I can’t imagine ANY of them being able to have even a similar feeling towards me afterwards if ever I were to tell any of these friends or co-workers about my sexual past.”

— “I would like to say that I am glad of this apparently serious and impartial study of persons, like myself, who enjoy this form of sexuality. It has been far too understudied, especially since it has, in my opinion, probably been the most regularly prevalent subculture form of sexuality in human experience. Also, I hope it serves to dispel and supplant all those idiotic, inflammatory and misguided Kraft-Ebbing references ... to zoophiles and bestialists. Thank you for your indulgence.”

— “Thanks for doing this! Good luck on your dissertation. Looking forward to the book.”

— “Thanks for this survey. It’s long overdue that someone does something like this. The homosexuals did it, and they are now accepted in society, so we zoophiles need to do it too. Believe me, hiding ‘in the closet’ is NO fun, and I need to get out! That’s why I ‘outed’ myself to my best friend and later, my mother. I needed to get it off my chest. Anyway, I want to thank you again for doing this. It’s very VERY hard to describe how much this means to me, and I’m sure a few others like me. We (the zoophile community) have needed someone to do this for a LONG time, and I know that I am very happy to see it being accomplished as I WANT the world to understand the zoophile way. And for those who lurk, as I did for so long, to have the availability of help at their disposal. Thank you Hani! Your efforts are invaluable to the zoophile community. With my deepest thank you, I send this to you. Best wishes in your paper and the book. Please tell me the title of the book when you get it done, so I can get a copy. Please also make your paper available to us, I know we all want to read it.”

— “Thank you for the opportunity to participate in your study. Unlike many Ph.D. candidates, I feel you have picked a truly original topic. There is a real dearth of scientific information on zoophilia. I am happy to help in any way I can. We are, I believe, one of the most misunderstood minorities in America today. It is hoped that this study will begin the process of promoting understanding and lead to further studies in the future.”

— “I wish you the best with your research, and hope that it will help a lot of people.”

— “I want to thank you for having the courage to do a study on this topic. There is so little information available, and what information there is, is outdated and biased. When I first had access to a college library, I did my own research into the topic, hoping that I would feel better about myself if I knew more about zoophilia. Unfortunately, what I found only made me feel worse. It wasn’t until two years later that my campus finally got hooked up for Internet and I was able to access the World Wide Web (in December of 1995) and from there find the talkers. It was there that I found the support and friendship that I needed. I hope you plan to make the information collected by this survey available to the general public. I, and many of my friends, are very interested in the results. I am also very honored to be a part of this survey. Good luck!!”

— “The study is a great thing and I am glad to participate. I wish you good luck for your work and would be very interested in the results.”

— “Thank you a lot, Hani, for doing this research. I wish you good luck with everything. What you are doing is very appreciated by many of my friends. Best regards, and may everything be well for you in the future. Thank you!”

— “Thank you for your efforts to understand us and help others understand.”

— “Thank you! God bless you Hani, and may He bless your work!” And —

— “Thanks, Hani, for being understanding, and undertaking such a monumental project.”

I myself am so thankful to all 93 participants. I could not have done it without them. This was the major reason I decided to publish this book, no matter what. I felt I owed this to all the zoos who trusted me.

There were also a few who were thankful for the study, but for different reasons —

— “I hope this study helps people understand their selves and help them to stop having sex with animals because it’s wrong. God made man and woman to be together.” And —

— “The most powerful thing for me has been ... to heal from animal sex with the cats, getting to the root of why I had sex with cats and clearing the trauma associated with the abuse that led to the animal sex in the first place. It has been very healing to move from a place of compulsive acting out with animals (as abuse memories surfaced) to the place, now, where I have no sexual attraction nor desire to act out with cats, and have a fulfilling, joyful and often ecstatic sexual relations with my wife. I wish all who suffer with this burden would know the joy I now know.”

There were a few who were worried about my intentions and the scientific credibility of the study —

— “I would like to share my concerns that to the best of my knowledge no double-blind testing is being done in this zoophilia study. Unless surveys are also sent to non-zoos, people that haven’t had sexual contact with animals, I fear that the study will be invalidated. Please do take the necessary precautions to ensure that the scientific community looks upon this study with utmost respect regarding its procedural integrity and form. Our image as zoophiles is at stake. We certainly do not want you or us to be made laughing stocks.”

— “I was a bit discouraged at the emphasis your questions placed on sexual abuse. I was never sexually abused in any way, and I am a zoo. If you are looking to find a root cause for zoophilia, I fear your

questions were inappropriately focused on one perceived cause, that of sexual abuse. Some people may think that the only explanation for the development of zoophilia would be abusive incidents during the person's sexual development. That, however, is far too short-sighted. Since I saw a great many questions focusing on sexual abuse, I fear you may be seeking to support these views." And —

— "You didn't ask a very important question about socialization in childhood. I socialized poorly, never going to parties or dances. I had few friends, and never dated. No doubt this had much to do with my difficulty in being intimate with another person. I believe it is a starting point for a range of abnormal behaviors, most of which would be far worse than bestiality. I feel quite fortunate to have chosen animals. I could have become a pedophile. Indeed, I used to feel some interest in that (a long time ago). I do think that it may be possible to switch a pedophile from children to animals, because of possibly similar roots. Inasmuch as pedophiles are rarely rehabilitated, it would certainly be worth a try, everyone would benefit."

The rest of the comments made by the participants involved reactions about zoophilia-related issues. For example —

— "I think that many more people participate in this activity than do discuss it. I enjoy it immensely!"

— "The majority of zoophiles love their animal companions deeply. I, for example, had to neuter my male German shepherd. This was due to him having cancer in his testicles. If we were only looking for sexual gratification, I could have allowed him to remain intact and enjoyed having sex until nature took its course. However, I did what I felt was right. I love him, and chose surgery. Our sex life is not great now. He is older, and not too active. But when he wants to have sex, I will be there for him. I never try to force him. I wait for him to come to me. I feel that the majority of those like me would have chosen the same way."

— "My life was a mess as long as I tried to deny myself and my love for horses."

— "Mankind has interacted with animals for hundreds of thousands of years. This contact has become an integral part of our subconscious instincts and construction. It is only logical that some number of us identify far better with animals than their fellow man. It would be pure idiot pride to assume that this is only now revealed to the society at large, for it was far, far more common as little as a century ago."

— "I wish that people would accept and understand what zoophilia is about. We are just like everyone else: good jobs, education, successful human relations. But I fail to understand why society considers this deviant. Yes, it is unusual. But if no one/animal is getting hurt in any way, and is handled responsibly by zoophiles, why is it wrong? Do not cast judgement until you have experience in these matters. No one else, besides me, knows what is best for me."

— "For a satisfying sexual encounter (esp. Intercourse) with an animal, it must consent to the action. I shall never force an animal to endure a sexual act. I shall never harm an animal for sexual or other reasons. I seduce animals just like I try to seduce human females. If they react positively, I am happy. If they don't like me, I leave them alone."

— "I had a long term relationship with a white American Eskimo dog. Our relationship was founded on love and trust, and there was little to no sex involved. When he died, I took it at least as hard as I took my mother's death. I have never met another zoophile in real life, and occasionally a small fearful voice in my mind wonders if the other people on the Internet claiming to be zoophiles or bestialists are just pretending and making fun of me. It can be extremely lonely at times."

— "Sex is a beautiful, exciting and invigorating experience. It can give one true joy and even let us perceive our own spiritual dimensions. But we live in a controlling, suppressive society that is all freaked out about sex and age and gender and all kinds of things. I cannot change the world so I won't even try. I do what I want to do and experience what I want to experience, and it is no body's business, really. But perhaps by sending you this questionnaire back, I am changing the world in some way :)"

— "I just hope someday that people will start to get an understanding of us. I am who I am, that's all who I am, and I love who I am. I'm a zoophile."

— “My theory is, animal attraction is going to be the only common denominator of your respondents.”

— “There are shades of zoophilia in my opinion and what’s zoo for one isn’t for another. My own feeling on this is that if you can accept that sexual contact can result from your caring for an animal and you are willing to perform that final step without coercing or forcing the animal, then you are a zoo. About the only person I personally would consider a bestialist is someone who is horny, fucks the animal for release and walks away. And if needed forces the animal to accept the sex. They think of the animal as nothing more than a live sex toy to be used. And even there, there are shades. In my mind, so long as you display a concern for your partner, I would think of you as a zoo. Even if you go fence-hopping or have casual sexual encounters with animals not your own. As long as the concern is there, I personally think zoo. It’s a personal decision for the most part. OK, I’ve decided I’m a zoo. How do I deal with it now? I think the main thing is to decide that what other people think or say about you is not going to determine your self image. Zoos tend to be lonely people in some ways because they have very little contact with others like themselves. So to live without guilt you need a pretty good self-image and to have become good friends with yourself. Admittedly that may not be possible. So, I want people to see there are different ways of dealing with these questions. You and I won’t see the final results, but, we’ve already won the war to get zoos accepted. Hani’s desire to do a scientific study is the peace treaty admitting we’ve won. By all of us individually being ourselves without being ‘in-your-face’ about our lifestyle, we’ve made our point. Every zoophile I know, myself included has viewed Hani’s study as a beginning of a way to find acceptance. The general view is that by being the subject of a scientific study, we will be recognized as legitimate people. That’s wrong. The study is the icing on the cake we all baked. The signing of the peace treaty acknowledging we’ve won the war already.”

— “I learned about the word ‘zoophile’ just one month ago. Until then, I have always seen myself as a freak, but had accepted who, and what I am. I knew about bestialists, and the stigma associated with it, but I didn’t agree with the concept of it. I have managed to survive by obtaining some (if few) social skills, and maintaining appearances of ‘normal’ sexual attractions. Most people don’t even know I’ve had homosexual relations. Even though I am ‘new’ to zoophilia (newly connected — 3 weeks — and newly found ‘zoophilie’ community), all of the opinions and reasoning I expressed are deeply ingrained within me. I consider myself as honorable if nothing else. I do support animal rights and abhor poor/cruel treatment. I had to put down my best friend and greatest companion 3 years ago. That was definitely the worst day of my life. It overshadowed my mother’s death (I loved her dearly) by a hundred fold.”

— “When I gave you this deep truth about my life, I do not know how or if you will judge me. I was as open and honest as I could be, and it even hurt bringing up those bad hate memories of the past. That’s probably why some of my writing is misspelled or shaken a bit. There where many times I sacrificed my animal needs of love and sex so I could use my time and money to help my adopted family and friends who had bad times and I was there for them. But many friends betrayed me, and I was poor. Now, even though I’m in my 40s, alone, at least I thank God, I have a job, roof over my head, and a couple of dollars — I am going to follow my dream. I hope to be accepted in a place with others who love dolphins as much as I do, where I can work and live with a female dolphin lover, soul-mate for life, for I finally feel it is my time to have a good happy, loving life with respect and kindness in the remainder of my God given years.”

— “I’d like to know others who have sexual relations with their pets. I’d like to explore more and grow more comfortable knowing this is very natural for me and that a politician somewhere in another time who was made aware of this felt it was a perversion. Consequently, a law was made. Animals are a constant source of love and sexuality is naturally part of the love — trust we share.”

— “A side note for you, another attraction for me is what is known as a ‘furry’ (anthropomorphic cartoon character). I know personally a furry would be the end all, be all of attractions for me as they combine the aspects of both human and animal in one. ... I am not sure, but a few zoos I know personally share the same attraction and feelings about them.” And —

— “When I became attracted to equine, I ‘fence hopped’ to be with mares. I used to think this was a ‘fad’ I was going through. Over 20 years later, though, and I am still at it — so I think I was wrong there :) The advent of the Internet has been great, as I have been able to talk to, and meet, others like me. As I was growing up, ‘locker room talk’ and other sexual conversations were an ordeal for me. I can now relax and talk with people on this! I have no desire to go public with this. I don’t think it will ever be ‘accepted’ and I don’t

care. I have become a professional horse person, also teaching/training etc., managing many stables over the years. It has been a great lifestyle and I have been very, very lucky to have found something I love so much.“

In addition, several participants sent me pictures of themselves and their animal lovers. One sent me a flyer about dildos he sells, which resemble animals' penises (even in size).

APPENDIX IV

“ARE YOU A ZOO?” QUIZ

SOME COFFEE TIME ENTERTAINMENT

I would like to share this quiz with you. It’s amusing, and provides another glimpse into the zoos’ way of thinking. Written by Xlupine. Thank you Xlupine for sharing this and allowing me to publish it.

Are you a zoo? — a little magazine style quiz to find out:

- 1. You see Elizabeth Hurley and Hugh Grant out walking their dog. Do you fancy:**
 - a. Elizabeth Hurley 0 points
 - b. Hugh Grant 0 points
 - c. The dog 5 points (the dog is a rather beautiful German Shepherd)

- 2. Does your pet sleep:**
 - a. In the kitchen 0 points
 - b. In the bedroom 1 point
 - c. On the bed 2 points
 - d. In the bed 5 points
 - e. On the damp patch 10 points

- 3. What physical features do you find attractive in your partner:**
 - a. Eyes 0.5 point
 - b. Smile 0.5 point
 - c. Glossy coat 5 points
 - d. Wagging tail 5 points

- 4. Who, if any of the following are worried about your sex life:**
 - a. You 3 points
 - b. Your partner -5 points
 - c. Your friends 3 points
 - d. The local Police 5 points

- 5. What sexually transmitted diseases are you worried about:**
 - a. AIDS 0 points
 - b. Syphilis 0 points
 - c. Gonorrhoea 0 points
 - d. Fleas 5 points

- 6. Do you wish that your partner:**
 - a. Would say that they loved you a little more often 0 points
 - b. Would mean it when they say they love you 0 points
 - c. Was able to “say” how much they loved you 5 points

7. **Do you like it when:**
- a. You partner tickles your thighs 0 points
 - b. ...without having to use fingers 5 points
8. **When you kiss your partner on the cheek, do you:**
- a. Get no reaction 0 points
 - b. Get told that he/she has a headache 0 points
 - c. Get hair-balls 5 points
9. **Do you have in your CD collection:**
- a. Closer, Nine Inch Nails 3 points
 - b. The Very Best of Cat Stevens (with track 15 played so much that its almost burnt through to the other side) 5 points
10. **Zoophilia is:**
- a. I have no idea 0 points
 - b. Perverse and evil and you will burn in Hell 0 points
 - c. 23 in Scrabble (try THAT at your next game) 2 points
 - d. Being an animal lover in every sense 5 points
11. **You and your lover will be together for “as long as you both shall live” because:**
- a. He/she said so 0 points
 - b. You are married 0 points
 - c. He/she gives total unconditional love 5 points
 - d. You “own” him/her 5 points
12. **You give your partner a box of chocolates. Does he/she:**
- a. Say “thank you darling” 0 points
 - b. Say “you know I’m on a diet” 0 points
 - c. Eat the lot and than hides under the table for the rest of the day because he/she feels sick 5 points
13. **Love is love, so what does NOT matter:**
- a. Gender 1 point
 - b. Genus 5 points
 - c. Rolling in something disgusting, creating strange smells, shedding hairs, barking at the postman, waking you up during thunder storms, stealing your Easter eggs, and when he/she finally gets right under you skin, dying and leaving a hole in your life big enough to drive a bus through 10 points

Less than 5 points — you are definitely in the wrong news group.

Between 5 and 29 points — in the woolly area.

Between 30 and 74 points — welcome to the zoo community. You will probably find that most of the world doesn’t understand you, and a major chunk hates you.

More than 75 — Stasya, I honestly didn’t think you would read this far... :)

INDEX

A

AASECT68, 211
Abodah Zarah..... 10
Actaeon & Hobbes36
Africa v, 1, 21, 25, 26, 27
African-American 73, 85, 192
Akeret.....41, 212
Alabama 35, 88
Alaska 88, 98
Algeria26
Allen. 7, 16, 22, 38, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 52, 102, 212
Alt.sex.bestiality35
Alvarez & Freinhar38, 41
America..... v, 1, 14, 27, 28, 30, 31, 55, 56, 64, 65,
83, 100, 213, 216, 262
American colonies 1
Amon 10
Anal sex127
Andriette 35, 43, 50, 212
Androzoons7
Animal Abuse49
Animal Passions.....210, 212
Antelope.....140
Anubis..... 10
Aphrodite 12
Apollo 12
Aristo 12
Arizona..... 28, 29, 30, 35, 88, 98
Arkansas.....32, 88
ASAIRS208, 209
Ascione49, 212
Asia v, 1, 22, 23, 31
Ass 12
Astarte 12
Auschwitz 21
Australia..... 24, 88, 98
Austria..... 22, 59

B

Baal9
Babylon.....9, 12
Bacchanalia 12
Bacchus 12
Bagley. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26,
27, 31, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 212
Barranca 29
Barranquear..... 29
Barrett212
Bast 10
Bears52

Bedouins..... 25
Belgium 16, 19, 20, 22
Belize..... 28
Bes 10
Bible 28, 160, 200, 213
Black Pagoda..... 24
Blake6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44,
45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 67, 91, 212
Bledsoe ..11, 13, 19, 20, 25, 27, 41, 44, 45, 50, 102,
212
Bloch11, 20, 21, 24, 27, 31, 44, 46, 48, 102, 212
Bona Dea 13
Bovines 90, 101, 129, 130, 137, 139
Brazil 28, 29, 64
Bronze Age..... 8
Bruno iv, 30, 31, 213
Bryant v, 28, 31, 47, 52, 62, 213, 218
Buffalo..... 140
Buggery 5, 34
Bull 53
Bullough10, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 213, 217
Burro..... 130, 222
Burton..... 22
Byrd 211, 213
Byzantine..... 15

C

California.....4, 29, 31, 32, 36, 53, 68, 88, 98, 208,
211, 215, 234
Camel..... 130, 140
Cameron v, 64, 213
Canaan 9
Canada 35, 36, 88, 98, 214, 233
Canine...90, 101, 129, 131, 137, 138, 139, 140, 218
Capital Laws..... 30
Caprio 5, 39, 213, 215
Caribbean..... 28
Caroline Islands..... 24
Cat 125, 267
Cauldwell..... 4, 44, 45, 46, 50, 51, 213
Cerrone vi, 38, 43, 44, 46, 47, 65, 91, 102, 213
Chee 41
Cheops 10
Chickens 29
Chideckel..... 19, 31, 42, 45, 47, 48, 213
Children 25, 50, 90, 212
Chile 27
China 22, 23
Chiriguano 29
Christy7, 13, 24, 38, 41, 43, 44, 48, 91, 213
Circus..... 13

Claudius 13
 Cleopatra..... 10
 Cole..... 213
 Coliseum 13
 Colorado 29, 88, 98
 Columbia..... 27, 28, 32, 35
 Connecticut 30, 31, 98, 217
 Consent v, 2, 49, 120
 Constantine 13
 Costa Rica..... 28
 Cow..... 46, 125
 Crete..... 12
 Crocodile..... 221, 224
 Cross-dressing..... 113, 114, 115, 116
 Crowell 213
 Cuba..... 28, 98
 Cunnilingus..... 132, 133, 134
 Cyprus..... 22

D

Davies v, 9, 14, 18, 20, 62, 213
 Davis... 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 31,
 38, 39, 44, 46, 47, 55, 101, 102, 213
 Deer 130, 140, 228
 Dekkers v, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22,
 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44,
 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 59, 211, 213
 Delaware 32, 208
 Denmark 18, 22, 54
 Depression 95, 96, 209
 Deuteronomy 9, 10
 Deviance 159, 217
 Deviant..... 215
 Dewaraja & Money..... 7, 37
 Dictionary 5, 216
 Dijkstra 53, 213
 Disease 217
 District of Columbia 31, 35
 Dixon & Dixon 46
 Dog 10, 13, 22, 23, 28, 31, 53, 54, 61, 102, 125,
 186, 187, 192, 206, 207, 210, 215, 217, 222
 Dolphin 210, 221, 222
 Donkey..... 22, 54, 125, 130
 Donofrio..iv, vi, 2, 3, 22, 24, 29, 31, 36, 43, 44, 45,
 52, 54, 55, 65, 66, 67, 180, 182, 214
 Douglas 10, 26, 214
 DSM..... 37, 41, 119
 Dubois-Desaulle 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20,
 21, 23, 24, 26, 38, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 214
 Dumont . v, 4, 22, 26, 28, 31, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 48,
 55, 60, 214

E

Edenn 46, 52, 53, 214
 Edwardes..... 9, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 214
 Edwardes & Masters..... 9, 19, 22, 23, 26

Egypt v, 1, 10, 11, 26
 Ellis 7, 18, 20, 21, 38, 39, 44, 102
 Ellison..... 8, 9, 17, 39, 43, 44, 46, 53, 136, 214
 Emilio & Freedman 30
 England..... 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 63, 214
 Enkidu 9
 Equines .90, 101, 129, 131, 137, 138, 139, 140, 214
 Eskimo..... v, 29, 30, 263
 Essen..... 47, 52, 214
 Etalon Doux.. 18, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 52, 215
 Ethiopia 10, 27
 Europev, 1, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 30, 31, 61, 63
 Evans 15, 17, 18, 31, 214
 Exhibitionism 96, 118, 119
 Exodus..... 9

F

Farm 41
 Farm boy 41
 Felines 90, 101, 130, 131, 138, 139, 140
 Fellatio..... 132, 133, 134
 Festival 29
 Finland..... 22, 98
 Fish..... 91, 102
 Fisting..... 133
 Florida 35, 88, 98, 100
 Focus Group iv, 2
 Ford & Beach 5, 14, 26, 30, 31, 46, 50, 51
 Forest..... 36, 205, 220, 233
 Formicophilia 213
 Fowl..... 90, 101, 125, 130, 138, 140
 Fox..... 5, 6, 35, 36, 40, 45, 49, 52, 67, 214
 France 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 211
 Francoeur..... 2, 168, 214
 Frequency 86, 92, 112, 117, 132
 Freud..... 41, 46, 47, 214
 Friday 20, 47, 48, 214
 Furries..... 36
 Furry 36
 Futz..... 31, 52

G

Garrison..... 8, 214
 Gauchos..... 215
 Gebhard .v, 2, 3, 45, 46, 55, 56, 57, 83, 89, 99, 180,
 181, 214, 215
 Gebhard & Johnson 83
 Geese 210
 Georgia..... 31, 32, 35, 88, 98, 208
 German Shepherd 77, 80, 151, 152, 192, 266
 Germany 20, 21, 22, 88, 98, 142, 178, 200, 201,
 202, 208, 211, 216
 Glacial Age..... 8
 Goat 11, 90, 102, 130, 138, 139, 140, 225
 Golden showers 133
 Gonorrhea..... 266

Grassbergerv, 59
 Greece v, 1, 11, 22
 Greenland..... 14, 40, 214
 Greenwood..... 23, 30, 42, 47, 48, 49, 212, 214
 Gregersen .. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27,
 28, 29, 30, 214
 Guatemala28

H

Habu.....23
 Haeberle 11, 40, 46, 51, 53, 214
 Haiti28
 Hamilton9, 13, 15, 17, 215
 Hammurabi8
 Handy.....44, 45, 215
 Harris 11, 12, 13, 51, 52, 215
 Hatasu 10
 Hebrew.....8, 9, 10
 Hermes 11
 Heterosexual vi, vii, 105, 116
 Hindu24
 Hirschfeld.....20, 26, 42, 44, 91, 215
 Hittites.....9
 Holmes 41, 53, 215
 Homosexualvi, vii, 105, 106, 117, 139
 Homosexuality 104, 216
 Hopi30
 Horse..... 31, 53, 76, 125, 147, 185, 220, 221, 222, 224,
 227, 230, 231, 232
 Hottentot27
 Humane Society 49, 75, 76, 177, 208, 209, 210,
 211, 218, 233
 Hungarian.....20
 Hunt .. v, 2, 3, 10, 17, 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 51, 52, 55,
 61, 66, 89, 91, 99, 180, 181, 215, 217

I

Ice Age8
 Idaho32, 35
 Illinois31, 98
 Inca.....27
 Incest.....vi, 57, 106, 111, 193, 216
 India24, 25
 Indiana35, 98, 178, 208
 Intercourse vi, 13, 49, 105, 127, 132, 134, 263
 Internet .. v, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 35, 40, 43, 49, 51, 66,
 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 80, 84, 85, 92,
 148, 149, 163, 173, 185, 194, 199, 203, 205,
 208, 209, 210, 215, 219, 222, 262, 263, 264
 Iowa58, 62, 88, 98, 209
 Irene 13
 Iron Age8
 Is 3, 40, 50, 67, 70, 77, 78, 83, 148, 158, 159, 171,
 188, 213, 229, 230, 233, 261
 Ishtar9
 Isis..... 10

Italy..... 8, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22

J

Japan 23, 98
 Justinian 13

K

Kagaba..... 28
 Kansas 31, 32, 35, 98, 213, 216, 217
 Kaplan 46, 215
 Karpman 5, 6, 38, 39, 40, 43, 46, 215
 Kentucky 98
 Kenya..... 26, 27
 Kethuboth 10
 Killing animals 18, 189
 Kinsey...v, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 31, 41, 43, 44,
 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 66,
 67, 75, 78, 83, 85, 86, 89, 99, 101, 102, 117,
 121, 136, 138, 140, 171, 172, 174, 180, 181,
 183, 189, 195, 196, 200, 201, 205, 214, 215
 Kinsey scale..... 117, 138, 140, 172, 174, 181, 189
 Knummu 10
 Koran 25, 27
 Korea 23
 Krafft-Ebing 5, 7, 26, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46,
 48, 215
 Kullinger..... 4, 11, 27, 215
 Kurrelgyre 6, 40, 50, 51, 215
 Kusai..... 26

L

Leal..... v, 28, 29, 51, 55, 64, 215
 Lebanon 26
 Leda 11, 52, 53, 100
 Leviticus 9, 10, 16, 78, 184
 Likert scale 83
 Liliequist..... v, 8, 14, 18, 19, 55, 63, 215
 Lintilla 36, 210
 Lions 140
 Llama..... 130, 140
 London & Caprio..... 39
 Louisiana 32, 35, 88, 98
 Lovemap..... 44, 216

M

Madagascar..... 27
 Maine..... 88, 98, 209
 Mandetta & Gustaveson 46, 47
 Mantegazza..... 11, 23, 27, 48, 215
 Mare..... 210
 Marie Claire..... 35, 215
 Marshall 6, 39, 43, 46, 215
 Maryland ii, 4, 32, 33, 68, 88, 98
 Masai 26
 Masochism..... 118
 Massachusetts 30, 33, 35, 62, 88, 98, 208

Masters.. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19,
20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 38, 40, 41, 42,
43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 91, 102, 214,
215, 216, 227
Masturbation..... vi, vii, 56, 71, 104, 112, 127, 132,
133, 134
Matthews iv, 1, 5, 20, 30, 35, 39, 40, 43, 46, 68, 87,
210, 216, 227
Maybury..... 11, 13, 19, 27, 47, 216
Mendes..... 11, 12, 198
Menninger... 23, 27, 29, 30, 41, 42, 50, 52, 94, 190,
216
Mesopotamia..... 8
Mexico 28, 29, 30, 65, 88, 209, 217
Michael 83, 216
Michigan 29, 32, 33, 58, 88, 99
Middle East..... v, 1, 9, 25
Miletskii, ii, 107, 111, 175, 178, 216
Minnesota 29, 33, 35, 88, 98, 178
Minos 12
Minotaur 12
Mississippi 33, 35, 58, 89
Missouri 88, 208, 209
Mixoscopic zoophilia..... 7
Mohave 29
Moll 41, 42, 45, 48, 51, 216
Mombasa..... 27
Money ... 6, 7, 24, 25, 28, 37, 38, 40, 43, 46, 50, 53,
136, 210, 213, 216
Money & Pranzarone 37, 44
Montana 29, 33, 99, 208
Montclair..... 17, 35, 36, 216
Monter..... v, 18, 55, 61, 216
Morocco 26
Morris v, 20, 55, 63, 216
Motoyama 68, 216
Ms 176, 178, 179, 208, 211
Mustelids..... 102
Mut..... 10

N

Nagaraja..... 24, 43, 44, 102, 216
Nasal intercourse..... 132
Native American..... v, 29, 86
Navaho..... 29
Nebraska 33, 35, 98
Necrobstantialism 7
Neret 8, 52, 216
Nero 13
Netherlands 20, 22, 211
Neufeldt & Guralnik 5
Nevada 35, 215
New Hampshire 89
New Mexico..... 29, 88, 209
New York..... 4, 21, 31, 33, 35, 52, 59, 88, 98, 212,
213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218

New Zealand 24, 232
Niemoeller...5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21,
24, 42, 44, 46, 91, 102, 216, 217
Nigeria..... 27
North Carolina..... 34, 88, 98
North Dakota 34, 208
Norway 22
Norwegian 16, 19
Nymphomaniacs..... 12

O

Oceania..... v, 22
Oedipus..... 42
Ohio 35, 88, 98
Ojibwa 29
Oklahoma 29, 34, 35, 88, 98
Old Testament 9, 10, 14
Ophiolagnia 7
Oral sex 113, 114, 115, 127
Oregon..... 35, 58, 88, 98, 209
Orgasm vi, 104
Osiris 11

P

Pan..... 11
Panama 28
Paraphilia..... 37, 212
Paraphilias vii, 118, 216
Paris..... 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 211
Pasiphae..... 12
Pedophilia..... 118
Pekinese..... 20, 23
Penelope 11
Penitential..... 15, 16
Pennsylvania..... 30, 58, 88, 98
Penyak vi, 28, 55, 65, 217
Persephone 11, 100
Peru 27
Perversion..... 158, 159, 160, 212, 213, 215, 217
Perverts..... 216
Pet.....vi, 31, 53, 90, 101, 102, 210, 211, 213
Philippine 24
Pig 125
Plutarch..... 11
Poland..... 16, 21
Ponape 24
Pony..... 222, 226
Pornography vii, 135
Poseidon 11, 12
Potter 31
Prevalence v, 46, 213
Psammetichus 10
Psychotherapist..... 178, 212

Q

Qiddushin 10

Queen 10, 49, 50, 217
 Questionnaire vi, viii, 64, 83, 84, 174

R

Ramsis 10, 12, 14, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 39, 41, 42,
 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 94, 106, 217
 Rape 198
 Rappaport 42, 91, 190, 217
 Ratliff 39, 44, 46, 91, 217
 Renaissance v, 1, 17, 61, 63
 Reptiles 102
 Rhesus macaque 140
 Rhinoceros 140
 Rhode Island 30, 34, 35, 208
 Rodents 101
 Rome v, 1, 12, 13
 Rosenberger 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18,
 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 38, 39, 43, 46,
 48, 49, 217
 Rosenfeld v, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20,
 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47,
 51, 55, 58, 59, 217
 Rural 213
 Russell 41, 46, 47, 48, 50, 217

S

Sado-Masochism 118
 Salisbury 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 217
 Sanhedrin 10
 Scandinavian 14, 16, 211, 216
 Sedang 23
 Selene 12
 Semiramis 12
 Sex with children 114, 115, 189
 Sexual abuse 183
 Sexual orientation 172
 Sheep 10, 59, 91, 102, 125, 129, 130, 138, 139, 221
 Shenken 38, 217
 Shepherd 7, 67, 80, 151, 152, 192, 217, 266
 Siberia 8, 20
 Sicily 21
 SIECUS 1
 Silvanus 12
 Singapore 23
 Sioux 30
 Snakes 91
 Sodomy 5, 19, 30, 32, 216, 217
 Somers 13, 20, 23, 24, 42, 43, 45, 48, 217
 South America 27, 28
 South Carolina 34, 35, 58, 89, 98
 South Dakota 35, 58, 89, 98
 Soviet Union 20
 Spain 15, 18, 20, 22
 Sparks 27, 46, 50, 217
 Specie vii, 129
 Stallion 52, 198, 210

Stasya iv, 5, 7, 22, 35, 36, 67, 69, 185, 186, 187,
 197, 209, 217, 267
 Stayton 5, 35, 217
 STD 147, 167
 Steirmann 41, 46, 49, 217
 Stekel 8, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 91, 217
 Stoller 41, 217
 Stone 8, 42, 46, 53, 217
 Storr 5, 41, 46, 47, 217
 Story v, 62, 210, 214, 217
 Suaheli 27
 Sudan 27
 Suicide 211
 Sumerian 8
 Sweden 8, 18, 19, 36, 63, 99, 215, 218
 Swine 51, 102, 130, 138, 139
 Switzerland 16, 20, 61, 216
 Sword 5, 6, 38, 42, 44, 45, 217
 Sybarites 12
 Syphilis 266
 Syria 26

T

Taiwan 23, 88
 Talmud 10
 Tanka 6, 7, 49, 50, 67, 217
 Tannahill 10, 17, 23, 27, 218
 Tanzania 26, 27
 Tapir 130, 140
 Taylor 8, 54, 218
 Tennessee 32, 34, 35
 Texas 31, 34, 88, 98, 209
 Thailand 23
 The Horseman iv, 1, 5, 35, 40, 87, 210, 216, 230
 The Wild Animal Revue.. iv, 11, 12, 13, 18, 21, 22,
 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 52, 53, 68, 85, 218
 Theodora 13
 Theophane 11
 Therapists 68, 143, 211, 218
 Therapy 211, 213, 215, 216
 Thoht 10
 Thothmes II 10
 Tiberius 13
 Tortures 17
 Transsexualism 119
 Transvestism 118
 Treatment 38, 216, 217
 Trimble v, 7, 9, 11, 13, 22, 23, 41, 43, 44, 45, 48,
 55, 60, 218
 Turkey 26

U

Ullerstam 26, 40, 41, 51, 218
 United Kingdom 88, 98, 211, 212, 213
 Uruguay 28, 64
 Utah 29, 34, 35, 208

V

Vermont 35, 99
Virginia 30, 34, 35, 88, 98
Voodoo 27
Voyeurism 96, 118, 119

W

Waine v, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 19, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 41,
43, 44, 45, 55, 59, 60, 218
Washington 4, 35, 88, 98, 212, 215, 218
Wisconsin 29, 35, 58, 89, 98, 208
Wolf 52, 140, 223

X

Xlupine 266

Y

Yebamoth 10
Yoruba 27

Z

Zanzibar 27
Zeus 11, 52
Zillmann v, 62, 218
Zoobuster 209
Zooerasty 5
Zoosexual 157
Zoosexuality 217