

MAPs, Zoophiles, and Transids

Validity discourse, and the Alliance

JIM BURTON – For publication June, 2024.

In my [previous essay](#) for HTOC, I discussed how associations between different socially marginalized communities can sometimes spell harm for the groups concerned. I conceded that to most, it's obvious *individual* Nazis can exist in any community without invoking the idea that every member of said community is themselves one. Within a western context, net harm would nevertheless come to sexually deviant communities if they were seen to form strategic alliances with fascist ideologies. I also documented my own experiences of being smeared as a Fascist, or enabler.

Another source of potential harm to sexual deviants, I argued, sadly comes from associations with other forms of sexual deviance. For example, greater visibility of Sadistic "[Zoophiles](#)" ([Zoosadists](#)) is more likely to further tarnish the public image of Zoophiles (Zoos) as a group, inspiring the passing of new laws^[1] against *all* Zoosexual behaviour. Greater censorship of allegedly "Zoophilic" adjacent identities such as the [Furry Fandom](#) would also be likely. While *non-practising* Zoosadists should doubtless be applauded for their decisions, there *is a reason* why we hear so little about "[Zoosadist Pride](#)", at least outside of a few highly questionable, and thankfully anti-contact online communities. The reason being, confirming harmful stereotypes of your own community makes very little sense as civil rights or identity discourse. At the same time, Zoos, Sadists and MAPs all exist in considerable numbers, and have a lot to gain from co-operating to overcome social invalidation - much of it arising from shared stigma. This leaves us with an ethical dilemma of sorts.

So, in this essay, I will make a positive, pragmatic argument for an alliance of the invalidated, using the nascent online fraternity between MAPs and Zoos as my example. I should stress, this is not an attempt to exclude [Paraphilias](#) other than Zoophilia, but to make my argument clearer.

MAPs at present, are in a situation similar to Zoos, with a few small differences. Both are stigmatized for their desires, which popular ignorance dictates are inseparable from "deviant" criminal actions linked to purported power imbalances. Both are also being distanced, or "pushed out" by larger adjacent groups, and are therefore haemorrhaging both demographically and in terms of credibility, to the benefit of those more socially acceptable identities. This makes it harder for MAPs and Zoos to reach critical mass alone; to get up-and-running as serious social/political movements.

Imagine for example, how much easier it is for a Zoophile to identify as a Furry or a [Therian](#) - the latter being people, mainly children and teens who undergo shift-changes, [morphing](#) (at least spiritually) into different species of animal. The numbers don't lie in this regard – polls and studies have found some overlap between Zoophilia and the Furry Fandom, with the potential for significant support from Furies on Zoo civil rights issues.^[2]

For MAPs on the other hand, those often hostile adjacent groups are taboo erotic fiction communities in general (principally [Lolicons](#)), and also on some level, [Youth Liberationists](#). There are also numerous queers who might otherwise identify in some way as MAPs or [AAMs](#); this includes [Transids](#) such as [Transage people](#) - some of whom it can be argued, suffer from similar stigmas.

All of these adjacent communities have their own somewhat understandable motivations for distancing Zoos and MAPs as the "real" sexual deviants, in a process social media users now sometimes refer to as "[validity discourse](#)". It is common for such groups to use the adjective "invalid" to describe other less acceptable groups (such as MAPs in general, or [pro-c](#) Zoos in particular). This term, a Gen Z reworking of "sick" or "degenerate", is obviously an attempt on the part of the larger, socially marginal group to present itself as arbitrarily "valid", i.e. clean, well-intentioned and harmless. It can be compared to [assimilation strategy](#) and respectability politics in the GLB Movement of the 1980s and 90s – something not alien to older MAPs.

How a Zoo-MAP+ alliance might work

While the communities I described as adjacent to Zoos and MAPs are not helping in any way right now, they could be considerable reservoirs for future recruitment. To take advantage of their adjacency to socially marginal groups, however, both Zoos and MAPs must have a game-plan, an agreed *common-cause* and ultimately an alliance to form their own critical mass.

If, say 10% of Furies *support* Zoos and *oppose* all validity discourse, here we have a population Zoos must rally to action and recruit from in order to contribute their part to an alliance of the invalidated. The same goes for MAPs and their adjacent groups.

These allies will always be to some extent, fair-weather friends. Consider, for example, the outright hostility and threat to life faced by out-MAPs. Now, compare this to the mixture of awkward bemusement and anti-woke posturing displayed by members of the public in response to Transids such as [Transharmful](#), [Transhateful](#), [Transjudaism](#) and [Transabled/Wheelchairquior](#) (their spelling). At best, we can at least say that all such groups are *deviant*. Many, Transids it appears have considerable demographic overlap with aggressively invalidated identities such as Zoos and MAPs.

One would still have to query the compatibility of an across-the-board movement, especially if its activities were to be conducted "out in the open". With *Transabled Wheelchair Warriors* and others already eager to burn along the avenues in Pride Parades, would it not be necessary for MAPs to take a "back-seat" for their own safety? And how could this be done sensitively, in a way not ultimately deemed to be exclusionary towards MAPs?

Not only that, but how does our movement deal with hostile operatives such as "pro-c [Biastophiles](#)" – people who want to legalize rape, or use it as a [political weapon](#)? This, in sum, is why it looks like an *online* informational movement based around an anti-stigma "accuracy" objective might be the only way to go. In the early stages, I would at least argue for this approach as a "soft-launch". Searching for Zoophile or even broader Paraphilia Wikis and information resources, however, sadly proves two things. Firstly, Anglo Zoos have nothing that rivals [Ipce](#) or [NewgonWiki](#), in terms of depth of information and frequency of contributions. *Zetas* (pro-choice/practising Zoos) have created [one notable effort](#), and an informative blog site called [Zooey.pub](#).^[3] There is still nothing methodical such as a [Newgon's Debate Guide](#) or a detailed [anthology](#), with relatively little in the way of Zoo research literature existing.

Secondly, outside of the corporatized, hollowed out and exclusionary LGBT paradigm, there is no online resource properly catering to a full *variety* of the most socially invalidated sexual minorities, and uniting them under *one mantra*. MAPs have *attempted* this, creating pop-up sites such as [Transid.org](#) and [Radqueer.net](#) to supplement the existing core of [paraphile social instances](#). Unfortunately, these are hardly ever edited, rarely read and therefore simply represent "cool ideas" their MAP owners once thought to be viable. They lack support from non-MAPs, and have no contingencies in place for content creation and maintenance.

There are also some fundamental oversights to so-called “[Radqueer](#)” ideology in that it includes rather discretionary identities alongside the foundational gender and age-based sexual inclinations. For example is [Transrace](#) going to inspire *nature-nurture* debates mirroring those for homosexuality, or paedophilia? There is of course nothing wrong with covering this esoteric ground alongside sexuality, but we should not in pained attempts to be “cool” and “valid”, pretend all such things are of equal *substance or urgency*.

So, we need to be clear as to the *something* our alliance is based upon. For me, that *something* can only be shared *social invalidation*, or relative “queerness” if you like. Accounting for the size of particular demographics, this forces us to focus more on groups such as [Zoos](#), [Young People](#), [Transgender People](#) and even the Men’s Movement. More so than our wheelchair-fluid friends, or [Transgrassallergy](#) sufferers, at least.

To this end, employment of the *noun* “invalid” has been [suggested](#) to civil rights organizers, as it makes clear that social invalidation is a fair-enough reason for *anybody* to be a member of the alliance, and that *validity discourse* itself is rejected. Identifying as “invalids” also makes clear that identities already considered “valid” or at least “marginally” so (e.g. novel Transids and fringe Paraphilia) will be considered *less urgent* priorities.

At the practical level, the new alliance’s rejection of validity discourse would mean the rejection of potential allies who engage in such discourse – many of them [anti-c](#)’s, although not exclusively so. In other words, to avoid setting itself up for factionalism and internal conflict, the movement would display an intolerance of the intolerant, as it set about finding its voice and purpose. Excluding the worst anti-c’s might be easier for pro-c Zoos. In many places Zoosexuality is legal, meaning anti-c Zoophiles are of little to no help at all - in fact, they are literal [antis](#).

For MAPs, who sadly face even [more stigma](#), anti-c alliances might be somewhat easier to maintain. In fact, under an alliance model, MAPs might even be forced to sacrifice extremist/abolitionist pro-c’s who can not moderate their demands somewhat to aid the early development of this alliance. Abolition demands would most likely be considered an inappropriate distraction from the alliance’s primary goals of attacking stigma and reforming existing laws. For some *Paraphiles*, on the other hand (e.g. [Biastophiles](#)) it will often be the case that only anti-c, counter-stigma activism is possible without advocating harm.

Whoever takes on this challenge will need not only a set of principles (principle always trumps identity), but charismatic leadership. He/she or they will have to communicate effectively:

- a) Who is in the alliance, and its purpose, but...
- b) How, in the *real world*, the Alliance’s members must (due to their fundamental, and undeniable differences) be *treated unequally to become civilly equal*. Rape/Noncon fetishists vs the Transgender for example.

Newgon’s Community Ambassador roles

On a related note, around a year ago, I created “Community Outreach Ambassador” roles at [Newgon](#), hoping I could encourage collaboration with some of the adjacent groups mentioned in this essay.

Recently, I announced a blogger with whom some readers here may be familiar – as my first such appointment. Famous for his legal battles on freedom of expression, and often maliciously mischaracterised by the media, **Eivind Berge** has been a member of the [PCMA](#) server for a few years, and becomes Newgon’s [Men’s Movement Community Outreach Ambassador](#).

NOTES:

1. Ultimately, acts of extreme Zoo-“*Masochism*” it could be argued, have been partly or wholly responsible for some of the few [laws passed against](#) Zoosexuality and filming thereof in the US.
2. See Tarro (2024) - [52.4% on Zooey.pub](#), [Furscience](#) (2019) and [Zildenberg and Olver](#) (2001).
3. For examples of relevant Zooey.pub articles, see [Opinions on the anti-contact Zoo](#), and [Non-Zoo Voices](#).