

## A MULTIVERSAL ANALYSIS ON THE CONSTANCY OF BESTIALITY

1. There in the desert I then walked through a marketplace crowded shoulder-to-shoulder where human slaves were given to animal prostitutes to engage in sexual acts. Often directly out in the open, though sometimes inside of tents of thin materials, human men penetrated primarily donkeys (both jacks and jennies) though by no means was all of this relegated to only human men and only donkeys. Any act of bestiality that could be imagined, I warrant that you could find it being acted upon at this market, for sale, the human slave owners giving payment to the human animal owners for the act. I did not take it that any party, slave, animal, or owner, particularly gleaned enjoyment from these practices. The nature of it seemed, if anything, spiteful, angry, malintentioned. I cannot emphasize enough that there were tens of thousands of humans present here, and that prostitution of animals to human slaves was the entire purpose to which all of them were gathered. I do not know what to make of it.

2. The wolf chuckled, ho ho ho! With my ears, I will hear the slightest twig snapping or grass rustling under your oafish human feet. Wherefore, bind up my ears as well, wrap cloth about my head such that my ears are pressed flat, and I scarce should hear you. The human did so. The wolf guffawed, ah-haw-haw-haw! With my nose, I will surely smell your trail no matter how far you go, across valleys and hills, even at a wide river I

shall merely find out your trail again on the other side, running about on my swift legs around and around from where your trail was known last. Wherefore, bind up my nose as well, drape a cloth upon my head entirely, such that my nose is all confined, and I scarce should smell through it. The human did so. The wolf snickered, krr-keh-keh-keh!, for as the human was distracted so, the wolf's mate was at the human's house, sexually pleasuring the human's wife.

*(Excerpts, 1: Walker R. Kansson's diary 601-34-4444-542944, 1703/04/02. 2: A Fable From Earsin, "The Fable of the Woodsman's Wife".)*

In the vast reaches of the multiverse, more variance can be seen, both in small details and in the fundamental macro nature of things, than the imagination unbidden would have reason to come up with, for the difference between one universe and another may be so mundane as to be effectively boring, or may be so drastically different as to be utterly impractical to consider in terms of what it means for one's own universe, for it truly is a comparison of utterly no use, the one universe is so different from the other that lessons in one cannot be usefully applied to the other. There are universes where humans are primarily left-handed and universes where humans are primarily right-handed. There are universes where humans speak different languages as in another similar universe, but where, indeed, the similarities are otherwise in lockstep, evolution has otherwise played out and history has otherwise played out the same way in one universe as in another, sometimes even down to the effectively identical individual humans and animals existing in one universe and in another, only bearing different vocabulary. There are, also, universes primarily occupied with empty space and universes primarily occupied with filled space. There are universes with discrete multicellular biological organisms, there are universes with megamacro biological organisms, there are universes with ethereal lifeforms, there are universes with symbolic lifeforms only, and the list goes on. There are universes rigidly ruled by formal logic 1 and there are universes rigidly ruled by formal logic 2 and there are universes rigidly

ruled by formal logic 3, and there are universes ruled by strange logic, and there are universes ruled by spiral logic, and there are universes ruled by fiat. There are not infinitely many universes. There are many universes. They are discrete, countable, finite. The number of universes is a large integer, but it is, keyly, an integer. There are not “no rules.” The nature of the multiverse does not support an argument of “There are infinitely many versions of meaning, ergo, there is no meaning, there are no lessons, there is nothing to know.” There are many versions of meaning; There are many lessons; There are many things to know; But there are not infinitely many of all of these; There are, for all the vast variances, also vast consistencies. Nothing, in the multiverse, is more consistent than the presence of bestiality. Some things are equally consistent with the presence of bestiality. Nothing is more consistent.

Here listed are some things equally as consistent in a universe as bestiality, which is to say, they are present in every universe:

1. There is something rather than nothing.
2. Jesus Christ The Savior.
3. There is a representation of sapience and a representation of non-sapience.
4. There is a representation of sexuality.

The last two, frankly, could be interpreted reasonably as mere operands, stepping stones, to arrive at the actually consistent thing, which is the presence of bestiality.

Here listed are things less often observed in a universe than the presence of bestiality:

1. Formal logic.
2. Euclidean or near-Euclidean space.
3. Time.
4. A representation of the concept of morality.
5. Literal life, e.g. literal biological organisms.
6. Music.
7. Alcohol.
8. Cannabis.

9. Predation.
10. Sport or indeed any form of trial.
11. Money.
12. A consistent name or names for Jesus Christ, if a universe allows for naming to begin with.

There is an example of all of the above on display that I find to be deeply cutting in its directness, its minimalism. I will quote from the observations made by one of the premier scholars on multiversal observation, Benjamin Tan Vel:

3. I observed a platform suspended in nothing and unmoving in time; This universe consisted of only this platform and that little which was atop it; I say "little" only in reference to quantity, amount, not "little" as a judgment of the value contained in the amount, you understand. The platform, if imagined in my universe's rules for dimension, would be a flat platform, no more than 3 meters by 3 meters (in fact this universe did not, even distantly, abide by my universe's rules for dimension, and all points in this space existed within all other points of space, a claim which I know is so outlandish as to be laughable, but I will elaborate on it later, to the best of my ability, and I think my justification for describing it as such will be nakedly apparent in its intended meaning, even if other persons may conclude with some other way to describe the sense of space here observed; The space was finite and discrete but was comprehensively interconnected, is the best I can do to summarize for now). What I observed atop this platform was all nameless but all identifiable. What I observed atop this platform was a statue of a human man and a demonic canid engaged in copulation; The demonic canid was mounted atop the man as a dog mounts another dog, and the demonic canid was using a phallus to penetrate the man in a way that nearly resembled how one might be penetrated anally, though the demonic canid was in fact penetrated through the man's very existence; The unmissable fact at hand was that the demonic canid's penis and the man's penis overlapped in space, the two existed at the same points in a way that would not be possible by my own universe's rules for dimension, and yet, here it was. There was one other

statue, besides that which depicted bestiality; The other statue, I warrant the more important statue though I have less to say on its description, depicted Jesus Christ, facing the act of bestiality, his palms pointed behind himself out into the nothingness beyond the platform. It is my belief that Jesus Christ, in this universe, was the force which kept the universe together, inasmuch as such a description as that bears any meaning at all, when this universe was not acted upon by time; What I mean is that if Jesus Christ here were not keeping the nothingness at bay, this universe would truly have been nothing at all; But He was, and so, it was. How did I feel that this was the case even as I also could not observe any discrete causal connection between his presence and the limit between existence and nonexistence? I do not know. I do not claim that it added up. It truly is not obvious to me if he even meant anything by it.

*(Excerpt, 3: Observations, by B. Tan, Volume 1, Chapter 30.)*

There are often universes without money, and therefore without the pursuit of money. There are often universes without any form of trial, and therefore without the pursuit of victory. The list goes on, at quite a staggering length, of things that have been called the true meaning of the universe, which, even if potentially the true meaning of a specific universe, are very clearly not the true meaning of the multiverse.

Consistently, every universe contains bestiality. This was at one time considered an unsavory observation, an impolite statistical fluke to call attention to, but its utterly perfect consistency, particularly against the backdrop of a multiverse where utterly perfectly consistent elements are highly rare, is breathtaking, important, and should not be looked away from, inasmuch as one might believe in “shoulds” and “importances.”

I have now long held the opinion that bestiality is more common than love. This was not an admittance I reached lightly, but rather reached very begrudgingly. Among other implications, it would follow that, if bestiality is perfectly consistent while love is markedly rarer, then it is specifically bestiality, not zoophilia, which is the consistent element.

There is a duality apparently shared between bestiality and Jesus Christ, in their consistency if in no other regard. This invites several very immediate questions. Are bestiality and Jesus Christ fundamental forces in opposition, or fundamental forces in cooperation, if they are forces as such with meaningfully comparable directionality at all? Is Jesus Christ the creator, and if so, is bestiality his creation, alongside the self-creation of his own image? In the same way as it would appear necessary that there must be something rather than nothing before there can be the figure of Jesus Christ, is the existence of Jesus Christ somehow predicated on the existence of bestiality, or vice versa, or do the two indeed at an equally direct level both spring up out of existence, or alternatively, does existence itself constitute merely one part of a trinity with bestiality as another part and Jesus Christ as another part?

There have been humans who never once engaged in bestiality and never cared to, and were atheists. What are these humans, in a multiverse where they have so starkly avoided both of the available focal points? Are they electrons? Worse?

Sometimes in my studies on all of this, I feel I am ascending a great tower towards the promise of enlightenment; Sometimes I feel like I am a drunkard illogically fixated on a dirty rock and truly enraged that it isn't revealing itself as God to me.

In some universes, the existence and divinity of Jesus Christ is utterly undisputed. In some universes, the existence and divinity of Jesus Christ and all of the details implicit therein are greatly disputed, to the point of enormous conflict. In some universes, the existence and divinity of Jesus Christ is ostensibly unknown.

In some universes, bestiality is ubiquitous and utterly unsurprising. In some universes, bestiality is highly taboo and controversial, to the point of enormous conflict in those for whom it comes to a climactic head rather than a stifling. In some universes, bestiality is risked rarely and done under great secrecy.

I have taken a side on the matter. Why should I not be glad to? Why, upon the face of a multiverse which very nearly only cares about this one thing, should I not be glad to stand out?