



feedists for fat liberation

Risk Profile Example

Activity – A restaurant stuffing session between one feedee and one feeder:

When it comes to a single stuffing session, we can break up our risk profile into **Short-Term Risks** and **Long-Term Risks**. However, if a feedee is not also a gainer/does not intend to gain, then long-term risks are not as relevant. For the sake of this example, we will say that the feedee is also a gainer and intends to replay this scene with their partner more than once.

Risks:

Feedee

“Short-Term Risks” have to do with possible consequences from one specific scene/stuffing session.

- Short-term risk: Public embarrassment if observed to be eating “too much”
- Short-term risk: An incidence of fatphobia or body/food policing
- Short-term risk: Wardrobe malfunction in public
- Short-term risk: Physical distress from an upset stomach/nausea from overeating
- Short-term risk: A feeder may be pushy on the quantity of food eaten, or boundaries may be crossed (need to negotiate mid-scene)
- Short-term risk: Damaged reputation or uncomfortable situation if someone you know sees you

“Long-Term Risks” have to do with multiple scenes/stuffing sessions, the consequences of gaining weight, or with practicing feedism as a Lifestyle Kink

- Long-term risk: Embarrassment from being recognized more than once replaying same stuffing scene
- Long-term risk: The fatter one becomes, the more likely an incidence of fatphobia/anti-fat bias may happen
- Long-term risk: As one becomes fatter, fatphobia/anti-fat bias in the medical system may mean that the quality of healthcare received will be lessened, leading to greater health risks for fatter people
- Long-term risk: Fat people are more discriminated against in daily life as well as in employment settings
- Long-term risk: Comments from friends or family on weight gain may lead to needing to explain or reassure people
- Long Term Risk - Certain chairs, booths, or places may become less accessible

Feeder

“Short-Term Risks” have to do with possible consequences from one specific scene/stuffing session.

- Short-term risk: Secondhand public embarrassment if seen with a feedee observed to be eating “too much”
- Short-term risk: Witness an incidence of fatphobia or body/food policing
- Short-term risk: Having to advocate for feedee after an instance of fatphobia or body/food policing
- Short-term risk: May accidentally push feedee to eat to the point of physical distress, may need to take care of or tend to them
- Short-term risk: What you are asking for may not be doable, therefore leading to mid-scene negotiations
- Short-term risk: Uncomfortable situation if someone you knew approached

“Long-Term Risks” have to do with multiple scenes/stuffing sessions, the consequences of gaining weight, or with practicing feedism as a Lifestyle Kink

- Long-term risk: Embarrassment from being recognized more than once replaying same stuffing scene
- Long-term risk: May have to be ready & prepared to advocate for or support a feedee in an instance of fatphobia or body/food policing
- Long-term risk: As one becomes fatter, fatphobia/anti-fat bias in the medical system may mean that the quality of healthcare received will be lessened, leading to greater health risks for your feedee
- Long-term risk: As your feedee grows fatter they might need more support from you on a day-to-day basis, or you might be needed to fulfill a caretaking role
- Long-term risk: Comments from friends or family on weight gain may lead to needing to explain or reassure people
- Long Term Risk - Advocating for a feedee or finding different accommodations when certain chairs, booths, or places become less accessible

Things to note:

If you are a feeder, understand that most of the risk involved may be taken on by the feedee, and that a role of support may be the most important thing to consider in a risk profile. For example, if a short-term risk for a feedee is an incidence of fatphobia/anti-fat bias, then a short-term risk for a feeder may be defending a feedee from such an incident (if they desire it or choose to not speak up for themselves) or it may be to comfort or reassure them afterwards.

Next, mark (highlight, star, whatever) those risks that would be considered, based on type and likelihood, to indicate how acceptable that risk is for you. I use this system:

- Green = Acceptable risk, as is
- Yellow = Unacceptable risk as is, possibly acceptable with risk mitigation (lowering the likelihood number)
- Red = Unacceptable risk

If you find a risk that is unacceptable as is, note what (if anything) would make it acceptable.