



Angela [redacted]

Ashton Anderson exactly. If a woman doesn't want to have sex with my son because he's intact, then I'm grateful for that. I'm grateful that he's not gonna marry some stuck up bitch

1w Like Reply



Heather [redacted]

No I'm still here. There's no body shaming being done - some things are a turn off, I would never body shame anyone that's just rude. You all however have called me names, mocked me, cursed at me - that must make you better than me

1w Like Reply

Angela, left, is using multiple sexual-shaming tactics common among "intactivists":

1) She is implying circumcised men are "impaired" or "castrated" (direct antonyms of the word "intact").

Circumcised men are intact according to the definition.

2) She is shaming women for upholding their sexual preferences. Incidentally, there are incredible double-standards at play here. To "intactivists", calling circumcised men "impaired" and "incomplete" is acceptable, but refusing sex with an uncircumcised man is unacceptable. Furthermore, common sense dictates that men who hail themselves "whole" are closer to arrogant than the targets—women—of her ad hominem.

Heather, above, is one of the many moms publicly defamed on social media—in this case, Facebook—for her son's medical care. These screenshots show the toxic passive-aggression in "intactivists", namely in their indirect shaming tactics.



Courtney [redacted]

My first son is cut (I was clueless 11 years ago). No pros. I regret it. This boy now will be uncut and perfect as he is.

Courtney, above, also uses a typical sexual shaming tactic by implying that male babies are less "perfect" for being circumcised. It should also be noted that her elder son, who is circumcised, will have to live with a mother who not only discusses but poorly illustrates his genitals on the internet. The regret is not his circumcision. The regret is his mother and the "intactivists" who made her delusional enough to believe this is appropriate.



Angela [redacted]  
 I tried to be nice earlier but after watching her disregard any piece of medical literature/ recommendation time and time again... like damn how pathetic. She doesn't care AT ALL except for how her sons dick might appear to others. Which is sad because by the time our kids hit puberty, he will be the minority. Yikes.

1w Like Reply



Jessica [redacted]  
 Uncut is best. Cutting is stealing their virginity, and its not our body to make that choice. I left my son intact. And cutting them is a risk of bleeding out and dying and its just not worth it.

1w Like Reply



Angela, left, is demonstrating another “intactivist” shaming method, which is to alienate circumcised males by projecting the assumption that they will become the minority in America. There are a few reasons this is problematic.

- 1) She is voicing an assumption as though it is factual.
- 2) She is stigmatizing the concept of minority. There’s nothing “sad” or “yikes” about being different, but “intactivists”, who hijack themes of diversity, aim to change that.
- 3) She is, predictably, assuming Heather’s primary or only motivation for circumcising her son was aesthetic.

Jessica, above, likens male circumcision with sex and the loss of virginity, yet another sexual-shaming tactic. This suggests far greater delusion and illness in the critic than in the practice, as with many cheap “intactivist” comparisons. To equate circumcision with rape is to demonstrate an incomprehension of what rape is. To equate circumcision with sex is to demonstrate an incomprehension of what sex is. To equate a pediatrician with a pedophile is to demonstrate an incomprehension of what pedophiles are. Do “intactivists”, who solicit nude images from parents on social media, who demand to know the genital status of other peoples’ children, **have a questionable relationship with rape, sex, and pedophilia?**



Ashton [redacted]  
 must feel really proud your poor son  
 can't fight back or say no so you can  
 torture him to cut your sexual  
 preference into him.. talk about sick..

1w Like Reply



Ashton, left, makes the  
 aforementioned assumption  
 that circumcision can only be  
 cosmetic and equates a  
 medical procedure with  
 torture. This baseless  
 comparison to torture is a  
 fear-mongering tactic.



Stephanie [redacted]  
[Yourwholebaby.org](http://Yourwholebaby.org) under the research tab  
 has everything you can research on. 👍



1w Like Reply



Stephanie, left, uses an obscenely  
 biased source for information,  
 literally named by the belief that  
 circumcised men should be  
 regarded as less whole. This is the  
 core of "intactivism": biased  
 sources and pseudoscience trying  
 to make itself seem credible.  
 Viewing the "Yourwholebaby"  
 among other vehemently anti-  
 circumcision websites does not  
 constitute research or developing  
 a moderate, informed view.



Shannon [redacted]  
 Cosmetic surgery on an infant is never a  
 good idea. Im so glad you're considering  
 leaving him as perfect as nature created  
 him.

1w Like Reply



Shannon, above, makes the amply false statement that  
 neonatal circumcision is always uninformed. She then uses  
 the appeal to nature fallacy to sexually-shame circumcised  
 males, similarly to Courtney on the first page. To expound,  
 rape is natural. Murder is natural. Abnormal cell growth is  
 natural. Just because something is natural, doesn't mean it's  
 better, and just people are born with vestigial tissue, doesn't  
 mean it isn't flawed, and if one were to make a sound  
 argument about how the flaw of vestigial tissue can make  
 someone farther from "perfect", then Shannon and her  
 hypocritical community would probably be among the first  
 to complain. Again, double-standards.