

A homophobe said to me, "I know what these liberals will be up to next: bestiality!" I pondered this for a moment.

His point was that if it was a liberty whether to have sex with the same or different genders, why couldn't someone claim it was a liberty to have sex with the same or different species?

The first objection that popped into my head was diseases. True, having sex with a dog (by itself) doesn't interfere with any other human being, but since sex with animals is largely unexplored a new sexually transmitted disease could be discovered. This in no way applies to human to human interaction.

One or several brand new sexually transmitted infection types seems like such a profound risk to me I would hesitate to say that it should be an obligation for the bestiality enthusiast to tell potential human partners he is engaged in sex with animals, and consensual human sex might at this stage spread a brand new disease.

The second objection I came to was the psychological dependence of the animal. How does one confirm that the animal consents, if the animal can't be proven to be a psychologically independent adult? In the animal kingdom, consent is foggier than in the human realm. The animals have as an alibi for coercive sexual practices that they aren't psychologically in control of themselves aka independent. Similarly, it isn't as frowned upon for underage minors to have sex with each other (because they both lack independence psychologically) as it is for an adult to take advantage (of that dependency).

Attraction to animals is rarer than attraction to the same gender. This by itself doesn't qualify as an argument for the abolition of the practice. It also doesn't necessarily make of bestiality fetishists a persecuted minority.