

## Circumcision quotes and info.

"Why do they call circumcision surgery? It doesn't treat anything.

sur·gery noun \ˈsərj-rē, ˈsər-jə-\

: medical treatment in which a doctor cuts into someone's body in order to repair or remove damaged or diseased parts

However, the foreskin has a myriad of functions, all of which are removed or damaged from circumcision. (see<http://www.cirp.org/library/anatomy/> and<http://www.circumstitions.com/Functions.html>) Since the foreskin is neither damaged, diseased, or abnormal, then there is no need for surgery. Other than pure cosmetics and outdated myths as to why circumcision is a good idea. Reasons for circumcision range from religious reasons (<http://www.jewsagainstcircumcision.org/>) to sanitary reasons ([http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7wIew1NFQSE&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7wIew1NFQSE&feature=player_embedded)) to aesthetic reasons ("I don't want him to be made fun of in the locker room" or "I want him and his brother/dad to match" etc, which also falls under cosmetic surgery"

If you still think Routine Infant Circumcision is a good idea, I suggest you watch these videos (VIEWER DISCRETION ADVISED! NOT FOR SMALL CHILDREN) and then tell me we should still be doing this to un-consenting, newborn boys.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bXVFFI76ff0> and

[http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xk8q2v\\_plastibell-infant-circumcision\\_news](http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xk8q2v_plastibell-infant-circumcision_news)" - **Caylon Guess** <https://www.facebook.com/groups/606249799393973/permalink/694680770550875/>

From the 2013 review of the 2012 AAP statement published in Pediatrics:

"There is growing consensus among physicians, including those in the United States, that physicians should discourage parents from circumcising their healthy infant boys because nontherapeutic circumcision of underage boys in Western societies has no compelling health benefits, causes postoperative pain, can have serious long-term consequences, constitutes a violation of the United Nations' Declaration of the Rights of the Child, and conflicts with the Hippocratic oath: primum non nocere: First, do no harm."

AND

"As with the other possible benefits, circumcision for HIV protection in Western countries fails to meet the criteria for preventive medicine: there is no strong evidence for effectiveness and other, more effective, and less intrusive means are available. There is also no compelling reason why the procedure should be performed long before sexual debut; sexually transmitted HIV infection is not a relevant threat to children"

AND

"As a preventive measure for penile cancer, circumcision also fails to meet the criteria for preventive medicine: the evidence is not strong; the disease is rare and has a good survival rate; there are less intrusive ways of preventing the disease; and there is no compelling reason to deny boys their legitimate right to make their own informed

decision when they are old enough to do so."

AND

"Circumcision fails to meet the criteria to serve as a preventive measure for UTI, even though this is the only 1 of the AAP report's 4 most favored arguments that has any relevance before the boy gets old enough to decide for himself."

<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/...>

MGM (male genital mutilation - i.e., infant circ) and FGM (female genital mutilation):

BOTH are methods of genital cutting committed against a non-consenting human being.

BOTH negatively affect form and function of the natural genitalia

BOTH are rooted in the attempt to control/diminish sexual pleasure (male circumcision in America got started in an effort to stop boys from masturbating, and Jewish scholars have even attested to the fact that circumcision diminishes pleasure).

And as such, BOTH are wrong.

There are various forms of female cutting - some forms are actually \*less\* severe/invasive than what boys in America are subjected to. And the most extreme form of female mutilation, which many people erroneously think is the only form (cutting off the clit, cutting the exterior genital skin, and sewing up the vagina) is actually not as widely-done as the others.

In America it is illegal to even perform the 'ritual nick' (one form of female cutting which is extremely mild in comparison to male circumcision) on a female child. This protection for females is unconstitutional, as it denies boys equal protection under the law.

Various forms of FGM:

<http://www.circumstitions.com/FGM-defined.html>

<http://maurina.wordpress.com/.../...>

FGM vs. MGM

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=98f3IavuEgQ>

<http://www.circumstitions.com/FGMvsMGM.html>

Similarities in Attitudes and Misconceptions toward Infant Male Circumcision in North America and Ritual Female Genital Mutilation in Africa.

<http://www.fgmnetwork.org/intro/mgmfgm.html>

Male and female genitalia are \*very\* similar - in fact, early developmental pictures from within the womb show that the two are almost impossible to distinguish

<http://www.circumstitions.com/Develop.html>

<http://bit.ly/kVJMj9>

Neurologically speaking, removal of the male foreskin is as destructive to male sexual sensory experience as removal of the clitoris is for females. This video discussion of penile and foreskin neurology explains why.

<http://youtu.be/DD2yW7AaZFw>

A visual comparison:

<http://www.drmomma.org/...>  
<http://www.drmomma.org/2008/01/mgmfgm-visual-comparison.html>  
<http://www.drmomma.org/.../male-and-female-circumcision.html>

Here's something to ponder (comment borrowed from a friend): "The same pseudo-science slime used to support false benefits of male genital cutting are also used to promote female genital cutting."

<http://www.themuslimwoman.com/hygiene/femalecircumcision.htm>  
<http://futureislam.wordpress.com/.../>  
[www.historyofcircumcision.net/index.php...](http://www.historyofcircumcision.net/index.php...)  
[www.rjgeib.com/thoughts/circumcision/response.html](http://www.rjgeib.com/thoughts/circumcision/response.html)  
[www.tantra.co.nz/yoni/circumsision.htm](http://www.tantra.co.nz/yoni/circumsision.htm)  
<http://www.circumstitions.com/FGMvsMGM.html>  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9r46b-Lm25s>

<http://www.angelfire.com/ca5/intact/fgm.html>

Additional resources, which touch on the history of circumcision and why it started in America:

<http://www.cirp.org/pages/whycirc.html>  
<http://www.noharrrm.org/docswords.htm>  
<http://www.noharrrm.org/circamerica.htm>  
<http://www.historyofcircumcision.net/index.php...>  
<http://www.historyofcircumcision.net/>

What some victims of FGM have to say about MGM:

<http://www.noharrrm.org/FGCsay.htm>  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ggqa6CCTR-4>  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=50BaM7H2GLI>  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WFNhM-F089E>

A warm and tight embrace,  
keeps me sheltered in this room.  
My safe and secure nest,  
I know this is your womb.

I feel the surges pushing me,  
and I meet a cold harsh light.  
Then suddenly I'm in your arms,  
and everything's all right.

Warm and sweet milky life  
,given to me with love,  
Then something firm snatches me,  
a hand covered by glove.

Laid on a cot, I'm wheeled away.  
Where could I be going?  
Am I going to be okay?

I'm pushed through the doors not knowing.  
There's the same harsh light again,  
blinding my sensitive new eyes.  
The door is shut, just me and them,  
will anyone hear my cries?

My arms and legs strapped to a board,  
I'm struggling just to move.  
My clothing from the waist down,  
is all that they remove.  
My eyes bulge with fear,  
I gasp, scream, and cry.  
Why won't you help me, mommy?  
I'm afraid that I may die!

I wonder where in the world you are,  
while my confused head spins.  
Its YOUR job to keep me safe.  
But, too late. It begins.

A cold liquid poured upon  
my most sensitive spot.  
Then a sharp needle enters me,  
burning icy hot.

Then I go numb,  
body and mind.  
I ignore them while  
they cut and grind.

Finally they finish,  
but I don't care.  
I have no clue  
how long I was there.

Returned to you now,  
you smile at me so kind.  
"Did it hurt him at all?"  
"No! He didn't mind."  
I can't help but feel  
that I lost a part of me.  
How can I go on  
when I'm not who I used to be?

So I eat and I sleep,  
resting long to recover.  
But I no longer feel safe  
in the arms of my own mother.

What if they come back  
and decide to hurt me again?  
Every burning urination  
is a reminder of what happened then.

Time goes by,  
I've healed from my trauma.  
I'm growing everyday,  
I can even say "mama!" I live a normal life,  
though I am NOT the same,  
but what can I do?  
And who can I blame?

I can only keep living  
and seek no retaliation.  
I accept my life as normal,  
and forget my mutilation.  
I live a joyful life,  
grow up happily,  
and in the process I forget,  
all that was stolen from me.

#### Rape.

Forced, manipulated or coerced sexual contact by a stranger, friend or acquaintance. It is an act of aggression and power combined with some form of sex. A person is forced into sexual contact through verbal coercion, threats, physical restraint, and/or physical violence. Consent is not given. Penetration of any orifice by any object, force or threat of force, or sexual contact against the will of the victim.

ARCLaw Won Cases: <http://arclaw.org/resources/settlements>

Legality of RIC

From: [www.doctorsopposingcircumcision.org/DOC/statement10.html](http://www.doctorsopposingcircumcision.org/DOC/statement10.html)

Doctors Opposing Circumcision Genital Integrity Policy Statement

Chapter Ten: American Law and the Circumcision of Children

In the absence of definitive legislation or court rulings regarding the lawfulness of

non-therapeutic circumcision of male children within United States law, there is some latitude for different opinions regarding its lawfulness.

## Introduction

Anglo-American law historically has been slow to recognize the natural legal rights of children. Partly this is due to an ancient but lingering religious notion that children were born tainted by sin and thus to 'spare the rod' is to spoil the child, physically and morally. Partly this is due to deference to the rights of parents who, for centuries, were deemed sole proprietors of their children, rather than trustees responsible for the care of a soon-to-be fellow citizen. Only slowly has Anglo-American law developed any recognition that the child, a member of the larger community and not a mere chattel of anyone, has rights independent from his or her parents, and, being vulnerable, deserves special protection.

It is not surprising, therefore, that with a long history of few identifiable legal rights, children have been subject to inhumane practices having more to do with social whims than with the actual day-to-day needs of the child.

It is true that we have evolved, haltingly, away from tolerating child labor, child soldiers, child sex objects, child prisoners, and child death-row inmates. But physical chastisement—withholding food, medicine, education, social interaction, and other basic human needs—is still tolerated, especially where religious beliefs of the parents are invoked.

Nowhere is the tension between ancient parental rights and the nascent rise of the child's legal rights as a citizen more striking than in the instance of non-therapeutic, merely cultural, non-consensual modifications of a child's genitalia. Subject to strict analysis under modern international law, and seen through the scrim of the developing rights of children, circumcision—a non-therapeutic procedure amputating a highly nerve-supplied portion of the child's natural and healthy genitalia, often without the slightest anesthesia or analgesia—would seem difficult, if not impossible, to defend.

## Traditional View

The medical community has assumed that parents may grant surrogate consent to non-therapeutic circumcision of children based on the fiction that non-therapeutic circumcision is a medical procedure and that parents have a "right to a circumcision." Circumcision of a child is considered to be lawful, provided that one parent signs a consent form after being fully informed of the alleged benefits and known risks. This is the view expressed by the American Academy of Pediatrics for the past three decades,<sup>1-3</sup> and it is the view that best fits the needs of the members of the AAP. The AAP is an association of medical doctors that has no power to make law or establish social policy. The medical community, thus far, has been unwilling to accept changes in law and ethics as applied to circumcision.<sup>4</sup>

There are many reasons to believe that this view is incorrect. The AAP's view treats the child as the property of the parents. In the view of the AAP, parents may do whatever they wish

to the male child in regard to circumcision. The AAP does not recognize the child as a separate person, with legal and human rights of his own. The AAP position, first enunciated in 1975, is not in accord with contemporary international human rights law and international bioethics documents, nor is it in accord with other policies of the AAP.<sup>5</sup>

### Contemporary View

Lack of valid consent. Parents do not own their children. Society merely entrusts parents with the care of their children until their children reach the age of majority. Although competent adults have very broad powers to consent, the power of a surrogate to grant consent is limited.<sup>6</sup> Parents must act only in a child's best interests.<sup>5</sup> There is no reason to believe that parents have any right or power to authorize the excision of healthy functional tissue from a child. A child is a separate person from his parent and has his own set of rights. Parents have a duty to protect the child's rights and person, which conflicts with any alleged power to circumcise.

Newborn boys are not born with diseased foreskins and, consequently, no medical indication for circumcision exists in the newborn period. The prerequisites for surrogate consent to treatment or surgery are:

a physical complaint, followed by  
a diagnosis by a medical doctor, followed by  
a medical recommendation for treatment,  
presentation of all relevant material information,<sup>6,7</sup>  
followed by granting of consent by the surrogate.

In the case of circumcision of a male child, the first three prerequisites are absent, so any consent for non-therapeutic circumcision would appear to be invalid.

Parents have duties to a child, which have been traditionally described as "their maintenance, their protection, and their education."<sup>8</sup> Parental "rights" are simply empowerment to carry out the duties owed to the child. According to Lord Scarman of the House of Lords:

"The principle of the law ... is that parental rights are derived from parental duty and exist only so long as they are needed for the protection of the person and property of the child."<sup>9</sup> If a child does not need a circumcision, then the parental power to seek a circumcision does not exist. A consent for an unnecessary circumcision would be vitiated and invalid, so any circumcision performed with such a consent would be medical battery or criminal assault.<sup>6,10</sup>

Moreover, consent for circumcision, which entails the excision of healthy, functional tissue,<sup>11</sup> does not accord with the parental duty of protection of the child's person from harm.

Offense against general criminal law. Every jurisdiction makes battery a criminal offense. Genital cutting without valid consent would violate laws against battery.<sup>6</sup>

Offense against laws for the protection of children. Circumcision also fulfills the definition of child abuse<sup>12</sup> and would be a crime of child abuse.

Offense against the child's right to bodily integrity. The common law right to bodily integrity was affirmed by the U. S. Supreme Court in 1891<sup>13</sup> and in numerous later cases.

Circumcision necessarily violates the child's right to bodily integrity. There is no reason to believe that parents are empowered to violate a child's right to bodily integrity in the absence of a clear and present compelling medical indication.

Denial of equal protection of the law. All citizens of the United States have a right to the equal protection of the law.<sup>14</sup> Female children are granted the protection of their genital integrity by criminal law that prevents excision of healthy tissue from female genitals.<sup>15</sup> Gender-based discrimination is subject to scrutiny. Parties who seek to defend gender-based distinctions must demonstrate an "exceedingly persuasive justification" for that action.<sup>16</sup> Courts must provide "heightened scrutiny" of gender-based discrimination.<sup>16</sup> Equal protection of the law is available to males just as much as it is to women.<sup>18</sup>

According to Povenmire:

"For female infants, the right to the integrity of the genital organs is protected against surgical "mutilation" by federal law and United Nations resolutions. Under the law, the right of bodily integrity is deemed so fundamental that it displaces any consideration of the parents' cultural or religious beliefs. Unfortunately, no similar recognition has been extended to male infants in the United States. The failure of the law to provide equal protection to males can find no "exceedingly persuasive" justification, and is unconstitutional."<sup>19</sup> The genital integrity of males should receive the same protection accorded to the genital integrity of females.

Protection from religion-based abuse. Some would argue that religious beliefs give a parent the right to violate a child's right to bodily integrity, however, that is not the case. The law makes a very clear distinction between the right to believe, which is absolute, and the right to practice religion, which may be limited by laws of general application. According to the 1878 United States Supreme Court:

"Laws," we said, "are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. . . . Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself."<sup>20</sup>

Children are entitled to protection from religiously inspired abuse. This matter was settled by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Prince v. Massachusetts*. The court said:

"The right to practice religion freely does not include liberty to expose the community or the child [p167] to communicable disease or the latter to ill health or death. *People v. Pierson*, 176 N.Y. 201, 68 N.E. 243. [n13] The catalogue need not be lengthened. It is sufficient to



show ... that the state has a wide range of power for limiting parental freedom and authority in things affecting the child's welfare, and that this includes, to some extent, matters of conscience and religious conviction."<sup>21</sup>  
and famously:

Parents may be free to become martyrs themselves. But it does not follow they are free, in identical circumstances, to make martyrs of their children before they have reached the age of full and legal discretion when they can make that choice for themselves.<sup>21</sup>

Parents may believe that religion requires child circumcision' but the right to practice religion is limited. Religious practice generally is subject to and limited by laws of general application.<sup>22</sup> The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which has been part of the supreme law of the United States since 1992, limits parental religious rights over their children to "religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions".<sup>23</sup>

Circumcision of children is a human rights offense. Male circumcision under international human rights law is discussed in Chapter Nine. The Congress of the United States ratified the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) (ICCPR)<sup>24</sup> on June 22, 1992. The ICCPR is part of the supreme law of the United States in accordance with Article VI of the United States Constitution. The United States has undertaken to guarantee the human rights recognized by the ICCPR to all persons in its territory (Article 2.1). Children have the same general human rights as adults, but have a greater right of protection due to their vulnerable status as minors (Article 24.1).<sup>24</sup>

State and federal courts are required and empowered to enforce the rights provided by the ICCPR (Article 2.3).<sup>27</sup> Rights pertinent to the circumcision of male children include the right to equal enjoyment of all rights (Article 3), the right to freedom from cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment (Article 7), right to security of the person, (Article 9.1), the right to protection during minority (Article 24.1). The circumcision of minor male children, who are legally incompetent, violates these rights. The ICCPR requires the United States and the several individual states to take action to protect the human rights of boys as well as girls.

## Conclusion

The law of circumcision is in a transitional state.<sup>6</sup> There is no clear reason to believe that non-therapeutic male circumcision of children is lawful<sup>6</sup> and many reasons to believe that male circumcision is unlawful.

Non-therapeutic circumcision of male children already is a criminal act in Washington.<sup>27</sup> Its continued practice depends upon the failure of public prosecutors to enforce criminal law. A law that more clearly expresses the unlawfulness of circumcision is needed for the protection of children.

A Chicago court concluded in 2006 that one boy is entitled to protection against circumcision and issued protective injunctions to the parents of the boy to protect him from circumcision until he reaches his majority and can decide for himself.<sup>28</sup>

Consent for non-therapeutic circumcision appears to exceed the powers granted to parents. A circumcision carried out without consent or with ineffective vitiated consent is an act of medical battery and may expose the perpetrator to possible civil and/or criminal penalties.

## References

- Thompson HC, King LR, Knox E, et al. Report of the ad hoc task force on circumcision. *Pediatrics* 1975;56(4):610–1. [Full Text]
- Task Force on Circumcision. Report of the Task Force of Circumcision. *Pediatrics* 1989;84(4):388–91. [Full Text]
- Task Force on Circumcision. Circumcision Policy Statement. *Pediatrics* 1999;103(3):686–93. [Full Text]
- Fox M, Thomson M. Short changed? The law and ethics of male circumcision. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 2005;13:161–81. [Full Text]
- Denniston GC. Letter to Louis V. Cooper, M.D. et al., October 15, 2002. [Full Text]
- J. Steven Svoboda, Robert S. Van Howe, James C. Dwyer, Informed Consent for Neonatal Circumcision: An Ethical and Legal Conundrum. 17 *J Contemp Health Law & Policy* 61 (2000). [Full Text]
- Seeking patients' consent: the ethical considerations. London, General Medical Council, 1998. [Full Text]
- Sir William Blackstone. Commentary on the Laws of England, Book 1, Chapter 16, p. 434. (1765-1769). [Full Text] Available at:  
<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/blackstone/bk1ch16.htm>
- Per Lord Scarman. *Gillick v West Norfolk and Wisbech Area Health Authority* [1985] 3 All ER 402 at 420, citing Blackstone's Commentary. [Full Text]
- Gregory J Boyle, J Steven Svoboda, Christopher P Price, J Neville Turner. Circumcision of Healthy Boys: Criminal Assault? 7 *J Law Med* 301 (2000). [Full Text]
- Taylor JR, Lockwood AP, Taylor AJ. The prepuce: specialized mucosa of the penis and its loss to circumcision. *Br J Urol* 1996;77:291–5. [Full Text]
- William E. Brigman. Circumcision as Child Abuse: The Legal and Constitutional Issues. 23 *J Fam Law* 337 (1985). [Full Text]
- Union Pacific Railway Company v. Botsford*, 141 U.S. 250 (1891). [Full Text]
- U.S. Const. amend. 14, §1; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 26. 18 U.S.C. §1116 [Full Text]
- United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515 (1996). [Full Text]
- Reed v. Reed*, 404 U.S. 71 (1971). [Full Text]
- Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan*, 452 U.S. 718 (1982). [Full Text]
- Ross Povenmire. Do Parents Have the Legal Authority to Consent to the Surgical Amputation of Normal, Healthy Tissue From Their Infant Children?: The Practice of Circumcision in the United States. 7 *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law* 87 (1998-1999). [Full Text]
- Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 (1878). [Full Text]
- Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158 (1944). [Full Text]
- Employment Division of Oregon v. Smith*. 494 U.S. 872 (1990). [Full Text]

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 18(4). [Full Text]

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 23 March 1976, in accordance with Article 49. [Full Text]

Protecting and realizing children's rights. UNICEF. [Full Text]

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 2(3). [Full Text]

Stephanie Rice. Circumcision Attempt—Father sentenced to three years. The Columbian, Vancouver, Washington, Thursday, December 16, 2004. [Full Text]

Schmidt vs. Niznik, Cook County Illinois, NO. 00 D 18272 (2006).

"What is even Left To Debate?!? You support your child's right to Intact Physiology and Optimal Neurological + Brain Development -- with them making any elected or needed choice later -- or you support your imagined right to steal their choice, permanently alter/impair them, and in-perpetuity retroactively try to convince yourself and the world you did the right thing!" ~ Athenaeus Alexander Dukas

"Circumcised(Sexually Mutilated) men are waking up to being raped at birth. Abuse is pretty mild of a term, sounds like spanking. Rape highlights the power dynamic of sexual aggression and violence of the act of circumcision. Male rape is still something men find hard to talk about because of our culture of male dominance and notions of masculinity. I am happy for boys who managed to not be raped(circumcised) at birth and feel nothing but shame and anguish for myself and other boys and men who were." ~ Zeon D V Kitchiner

#### What is Lost to Circumcision

Gary L. Harryman

When a baby boy's natural and intact penis is "circumcised," this is what is lost forever:

- \*1. The frenar band of soft ridges—the single most pleasure producing zone on the male body. Loss of this densely innervated and reactive belt of tissue reduces the sensitivity of the remaining penis to about that of ordinary skin.
2. Approximately half of the temperature reactive smooth muscle sheath called the dartos fascia.
3. Specialized epithelial Langerhans cells, a component of the immune system.
- \*4. An estimated 240 feet of microscopic nerves, including branches of the dorsal nerve.
- \*5. Between 10,000 to 20,000 specialized erotogenic nerve endings of several types, which can discern slight motion, subtle changes in temperature, and fine gradations in texture. This loss includes thousands of coiled fine-touch receptors called the Meissner's corpuscles – the most important sensory component in the foreskin.
6. Estrogen receptors the purpose and value of which are not yet fully understood.
- \*7. More than 50% of the mobile penile skin, the multi-purpose covering of the glans, that shields all of the specialized penile skin from abrasion, drying, and callusing (by keratin cell layering), and protects it from dirt and other contaminants. The debilitating sexual consequences of keratinizing the glans have never been studied.
8. The immunological defense system of the soft mucosa, which may produce antibacterial and antiviral proteins such as lysozyme, also found in mothers milk, and plasma cells, which secrete immunoglobulin antibodies.
9. Lymphatic vessels, the loss of which interrupts the lymph flow within a part of the bodys immune system.
- \*10. The frenulum, the very sensitive "V" shaped web-like tethering structure on the underside of the glans; usually amputated along with the foreskin, or severed, which destroys its functionality.
- \*11. The apocrine glands of the inner foreskin, which produce pheromones—nature's powerful, silent, invisible behavioral signals to potential sexual partners. They contribute significantly to sexuality. Their loss is unstudied.
12. Ectopic sebaceous glands, which lubricate and moisturize.
- \*13. The essential "gliding" mechanism. If unfolded and spread out flat, the average adult foreskin measures about 15 square inches, the size of a postcard. This abundance of specialized, self-lubricating mobile skin gives the natural penis its unique hallmark ability to smoothly "glide" in and out within itself—permitting natural non-abrasive masturbation and intercourse, without drying out the vagina or requiring artificial lubricants.
14. The pink to red to dark purple natural coloration of the glans, normally an internal organ, like the tongue.
- \*15. A significant amount of the penis circumference because its double layered wrapping of loose foreskin is now

missing making the circumcised penis defectively thinner than a full-sized intact penis.

\*16. As much as one inch of the erect penis length due to amputation when the connective tissue is torn apart during "circumcision." This shared membrane tightly fuses the foreskin and the glans together while the penis develops. Ripping it apart wounds the glans, leaving it raw and subject to infection, scarring, and shrinkage.

\*17. Several feet of blood vessels, including the frenular artery and branches of the dorsal artery. The loss of this dense vascularity interrupts normal blood flow to the shaft and glans of the penis, obviously damaging its natural function and possibly stunting its complete and healthy development.

18. Every year boys lose their penises altogether from botched "circumcisions" and infections accidents happen. They are then "sexually reassigned" by transgender surgery and must live their lives as females.

19. Every year many boys lose their lives from the complications of medically unnecessary circumcisions. The cause of these deaths are a fact the billion dollar per year circumcision industry willfully obscures and conceals.

\*20. Although not yet proved scientifically, there is considerable new evidence that an incomplete penis loses its capacity for the subtle electromagnetic "cross-communication" that occurs only during contact between two mucous membranes, and which contributes to the perception of sexual ecstasy. In other words, medically unjustified foreskin amputation of boys ultimately diminishes the intensity of orgasms for both men and women!

Gary L. Harryman,

14 February 1999 What is Lost to Circumcision

Gary L. Harryman

When a baby boy's natural and intact penis is "circumcised," this is what is lost forever:

\*1. The frenar band of soft ridges—the single most pleasure producing zone on the male body. Loss of this densely innervated and reactive belt of tissue reduces the sensitivity of the remaining penis to about that of ordinary skin.

2. Approximately half of the temperature reactive smooth muscle sheath called the dartos fascia.

3. Specialized epithelial Langerhans cells, a component of the immune system.

\*4. An estimated 240 feet of microscopic nerves, including branches of the dorsal nerve.

\*5. Between 10,000 to 20,000 specialized erotogenic nerve endings of several types, which can discern slight motion, subtle changes in temperature, and fine gradations in texture. This loss includes thousands of coiled fine-touch receptors called the Meissner's corpuscles – the most important sensory component in the foreskin.

6. Estrogen receptors the purpose and value of which are not yet fully understood.

\*7. More than 50% of the mobile penile skin, the multi-purpose covering of the glans, that shields all of the specialized penile skin from abrasion, drying, and callusing (by keratin cell layering), and protects it from dirt and other contaminants. The debilitating sexual consequences of keratinizing the glans have never been studied.

8. The immunological defense system of the soft mucosa, which may produce antibacterial and antiviral proteins such as lysozyme, also found in mothers milk, and plasma cells, which secrete immunoglobulin antibodies.

9. Lymphatic vessels, the loss of which interrupts the lymph flow within a part of the bodys immune system.

\*10. The frenulum, the very sensitive "V" shaped web-like tethering structure on the underside of the glans; usually amputated along with the foreskin, or severed, which destroys its functionality.

\*11. The apocrine glands of the inner foreskin, which produce pheromones—nature's powerful, silent, invisible behavioral signals to potential sexual partners. They contribute significantly to sexuality. Their loss is unstudied.

12. Ectopic sebaceous glands, which lubricate and moisturize.

\*13. The essential "gliding" mechanism. If unfolded and spread out flat, the average adult foreskin measures about 15 square inches, the size of a postcard. This abundance of specialized, self-lubricating mobile skin gives the natural penis its unique hallmark ability to smoothly "glide" in and out within itself—permitting natural non-abrasive masturbation and intercourse, without drying out the vagina or requiring artificial lubricants.

14. The pink to red to dark purple natural coloration of the glans, normally an internal organ, like the tongue.

\*15. A significant amount of the penis circumference because its double layered wrapping of loose foreskin is now missing making the circumcised penis defectively thinner than a full-sized intact penis.

\*16. As much as one inch of the erect penis length due to amputation when the connective tissue is torn apart during "circumcision." This shared membrane tightly fuses the foreskin and the glans together while the penis develops. Ripping it apart wounds the glans, leaving it raw and subject to infection, scarring, and shrinkage.

\*17. Several feet of blood vessels, including the frenular artery and branches of the dorsal artery. The loss of this dense vascularity interrupts normal blood flow to the shaft and glans of the penis, obviously damaging its natural function and possibly stunting its complete and healthy development.

18. Every year boys lose their penises altogether from botched "circumcisions" and infections accidents happen. They are then "sexually reassigned" by transgender surgery and must live their lives as females.

19. Every year many boys lose their lives from the complications of medically unnecessary circumcisions. The cause of these deaths are a fact the billion dollar per year circumcision industry willfully obscures and conceals.

\*20. Although not yet proved scientifically, there is considerable new evidence that an incomplete penis loses its

capacity for the subtle electromagnetic "cross-communication" that occurs only during contact between two mucous membranes, and which contributes to the perception of sexual ecstasy. In other words, medically unjustified foreskin amputation of boys ultimately diminishes the intensity of orgasms for both men and women!

Gary L. Harryman,

14 February 1999

"[...] Circumcision in 315 boys aged from 3 weeks to 16 years (median five years) were evaluated. A total of 16 boys (5.1%) had significant complications [...] Before surgery, parents should be counselled in detail and should be required to provide their informed consent that the possible health benefits of childhood circumcision do not outweigh the reported complication rate

[...]"[http://www.danmedj.dk/portal/page/portal/danmedj.dk/dmj\\_forside/PAST\\_ISSUE/2013/DMJ\\_2013\\_08/A4681](http://www.danmedj.dk/portal/page/portal/danmedj.dk/dmj_forside/PAST_ISSUE/2013/DMJ_2013_08/A4681)

38 presidents and representatives of several national medical associations and societies of pediatricians and pediatric surgeons from 16 countries: "There are no compelling health arguments in favor of circumcision, while it can have serious long-term urological, psychological and sexual consequences. And performing medically unwarranted circumcision of underage boys conflicts with good medical practice. Male infant circumcision conflicts with children's rights and the doctors' oath not to do

harm." <http://knmg.artsennet.nl/Nieuws/Nieuwsarchief/Nieuwsbericht-1/International-physicians-protest-against-American-Academy-of-Pediatrics-policy-on-infant-male-circumcision.htm>

Wound care is big business in America. Do you know that the stolen not "donated" foreskin of your baby is being sold to repair wounds? ~Jeni

[http://www.dermagraft.com/wp-content/uploads/Dermagraft\\_Directions\\_for\\_Use.pdf](http://www.dermagraft.com/wp-content/uploads/Dermagraft_Directions_for_Use.pdf)

\*\*\*\*Dermagraft is manufactured from human fibroblast cells derived from donated newborn foreskin tissue. \*\*\*\*\*During the manufacturing process, the human fibroblasts are seeded onto a bioabsorbable polyglactin mesh scaffold. The fibroblasts proliferate to fill the interstices of this scaffold and secrete human dermal collagen, matrix proteins, growth factors and cytokines, to create a three-dimensional human dermal substitute containing metabolically active, living cells. Dermagraft does not contain macrophages, lymphocytes, blood vessels, or hair follicles.

There's currently a lot of hype surrounding circumcision and the transmission of HIV. The word on people's lips is that "circumcision reduces HIV transmission by 60%." The claim is based on the result of three major "studies" that were carried out in Africa, but there are a few confounding factors that bring the validity of these so-called "studies" into question. One of the greatest confounding factors in these studies is empirical evidence to the contrary; real world data from countries where circumcision is already a widespread practice and studies with contrary results.

Countries in Africa

Let's begin with countries in Africa, where these "studies" would be relevant. According to demographic health surveys performed in other countries in Africa, HIV transmission was prevalent in circumcised men in at least 6 different countries. I go one by one, analyzing some of the commentary in these surveys, some of which seems to be revealing of the researchers' bias.

## Cameroon

In Cameroon, where 91% of the male population is circumcised, the ratio of circumcised men vs. intact men who contracted HIV was 4.1 vs. 1.1. (See p. 17)

<http://www.measuredhs.com/pubs...>

## Ghana

"...the vast majority of Ghanaian men (95 percent) are circumcised... There is little difference in the HIV prevalence by circumcision status..." (1.6 vs 1.4 See p. 13)

<http://www.measuredhs.com/pubs...>

## Lesotho

In Lesotho, 23% of the men are circumcised, and the ratio circumcised men vs. intact men who contracted HIV was 22.8 vs 15.2.

"The relationship between male circumcision and HIV levels in Lesotho does not conform to the expected pattern of higher rates among uncircumcised men than circumcised men. The HIV rate is in fact substantially higher among circumcised men (23 percent) than among men who are not circumcised (15 percent). Moreover, the pattern of higher infection rates among circumcised men compared with uncircumcised men is virtually uniform across the various subgroups for which results are shown in the table. This finding could be explained by the Lesotho custom to conduct male circumcision later in life, when the individuals have already been exposed to the risk of HIV infection. (Additional analysis is necessary to better understand the unexpected pattern in Table 12.9.)" (p. 13)

What is disturbing here is that it seems researchers grope for a reason to dismiss these results because they are not what they are looking for; a positive result for circumcision. The above is an interesting defense of male circumcision, given the fact that the latest "studies," if they can even be called that, observed HIV transmission in men circumcised as adults. Then again, this demographic health survey was conducted in 2004, BEFORE the newer "studies" in 2006. Nonetheless, the unproven assertion that "circumcision is only effective in reducing the risk of HIV when done in infancy" persists in some circles.

<http://www.measuredhs.com/pubs...>

## Malawi

In Malawi, 20% of the male population is circumcised. The ratio of circumcised vs. intact men who contracted HIV was 13.2 vs 9.5.

"The relationship between HIV prevalence and circumcision status is not in the expected direction. In Malawi, circumcised men have a slightly higher HIV infection rate than men who were not circumcised (13 percent compared with 10 percent). In Malawi, the majority of men are not circumcised (80 percent)(...where one would expect HIV to be the most rampant... note the "expected direction.") (p. 10)

<http://www.measuredhs.com/pubs...>

#### Rwanda

According to a demographic health survey taken in 2005, the ratio of circumcised vs. intact men who contracted HIV was 3.8 vs 2.1. (See p. 10)

<http://www.measuredhs.com/pubs...>

#### Swaziland

In a recent demographic health survey (2006-2007), the ratio of circumcised vs. intact men who contracted HIV was found to be 22 vs. 20.

As Table 14.10 shows, the relationship between HIV prevalence and circumcision status is not in the expected direction. Circumcised men have a slightly higher HIV infection rate than men who are not circumcised (22 percent compared with 20 percent). (p. 256)

<http://www.measuredhs.com/pubs...>

Here is that "expected direction" again. The majority of Swazi men are uncircumcised, and one would especially expect to see HIV prevalence here. HIV transmission was more prevalent in the circumcised men here, yet our (the US) government has decided to spend millions on a campaign to circumcise 80% of the men in Swaziland.

<http://joseph4gi.blogspot.com/...>

#### Other Countries Where HIV/Circumcision Rates Don't Correlate

##### Malaysia

According to Malaysian AIDS Council vice-president Datuk Zaman Khan, more than 70% of the 87,710 HIV/AIDS sufferers in the country are Muslims. In Malaysia, most, if not all Muslim men are circumcised, whereas circumcision is uncommon in the non-Muslim community. 60% of the Malaysian population is Muslim, which means that HIV is spreading in the community where most men are circumcised at an even faster rate, than in the community where most men are intact.

<http://www.mmail.com.my/conten...>

##### The Philippines

In the Philippines, the majority of the male population is circumcised, as it is seen as an important rite of passage. In the 2010 Global AIDS report released by UNAIDS in late November, the Philippines was one of seven nations in the world which reported over 25 percent in new HIV infections between 2001 and 2009, whereas other countries have either stabilized or shown significant declines in the rate of new infections. Among all countries in Asia, only the Philippines and Bangladesh are reporting increases in HIV cases, with others either stable or decreasing.



<http://globalnation.inquirer.n...>

Israel

Despite circumcision being near-universal, it hasn't stopped HIV transmission in Israel.

<http://www.haaretz.com/print-e...>

<http://www.haaretz.com/print-e...>

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/ha...>

<http://www.haaretz.com/print-e...>

The most obvious smoking gun: The United States of America, Circumcision hasn't stopped HIV in our own country.

<http://data.unaids.org/pub/Rep...>

And, it hasn't stopped other STDs either.

<http://www.reuters.com/article...>

In America, the majority of the male population is circumcised, approximately 80%, while in most countries in Europe, circumcision is uncommon. Despite these facts, our country does poorly.

<http://www.advocatesforyouth.o...>

In fact, AIDS rates in some US Cities rival hotspots in Africa. In some parts of the U.S., they're actually higher than those in sub-Saharan Africa. According to a 2010 study published in the New England Journal of Medicine, rates of HIV among adults in Washington, D.C. exceed 1 in 30; rates higher than those reported in Ethiopia, Nigeria or Rwanda.

<http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/1...>

The Washington D.C. district report on HIV and AIDS reported an increase of 22% from 2006 in 2009:

"[Washington D.C.'s] rates are higher than West Africa... they're on par with Uganda and some parts of Kenya." Shannon L. Hader, HIV/AIDS Administration, Washington D.C., March 15, 2009  
She once led the Federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's work in Zimbabwe.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/...>

One would expect for there to be a lower transmission rates in the United States, and for HIV to be rampant in Europe; HIV transmission rates are in fact higher in the United States, where most men are circumcised, than in various countries in Europe, where most men are intact. It is telling that the HIV epidemic struck in our country in the 1980s, 90% of the male population was already circumcised. Somehow, we're supposed to believe that what didn't



worked in our own country, or anywhere else, is going to start working miracles in Africa.

I just had a thought. What if you grew up blind, with blind parents, and blind siblings, so you never knew anything was out of the ordinary about being blind? Being perfectly fine with blindness you then leave the little bubble world of home and encounter people who can see just fine, in a world full of sighted people, full of sights you never knew existed. What would your reaction be upon finding out that you were not actually born blind, but your parents actually decided to have your optic nerves severed shortly after birth, so you can be just like them? Would you be OK with them having made that life changing choice for you? Or would you have rather been able to choose for yourself to experience the world with your own eyes first, and decide whether or not to, say, wear a blindfold in order to experience the world the way they do? I know, it's a strange thought. I doubt anyone would ever do something to their child for such a silly reason, right? I mean, who would have a medically unnecessary procedure done to their new born just because their parents did it to them, and they want their kid to be just like them? Oh... wait. -Aaron Ingebrigtsen

A baby with a serious heart condition is circumcised, bleeds profusely, and dies. But we're not supposed to blame it on circumcision, because the baby had a heart condition.

A toddler is put under general anesthesia to be circumcised, and he dies shortly after he wakes up. But we're not supposed to blame it on the circumcision, because it was probably just the anesthesia.

A hemophiliac baby is circumcised, bleeds profusely from his circumcision wound, and dies. But we're not supposed to blame circumcision, because the baby was hemophiliac.

A healthy baby is circumcised, an artery is nicked, he bleeds out and dies. But we're not supposed to blame circumcision, because it was the severing of the artery that caused the blood loss.

A healthy baby is circumcised, the Mogen clamp slips, and a large portion of his penis is amputated. But we're not supposed to blame circumcision, because it's the fault of the clamp, which has caused similar injury in the past.

A healthy baby is circumcised and the doctor takes "too much" skin off, causing buried penis. But we're not supposed to blame circumcision, because it was probably just the fault of the doctor.

If someone shoots you, and you have a heart condition, and the blood loss causes your heart to race and you die, is it fair to say your death was caused by nothing but your heart condition?

If you are hemophiliac, and someone stabs you, and you bleed profusely, is it fair to say your death was caused by nothing but hemophilia?

Circumcision is 100% unnecessary. The toddler should have never been under anesthesia without true medical emergency. The hemophiliac baby and the baby with the heart defect never should have been circumcised. If it wasn't for the circumcision these boys would more than likely have lived to see

adulthood.

Bronselaer, G. A., Schober, J. M., Meyer-Bahlburg, H. F.L., T'Sjoen, G., Vlietinck, R. and Hoebeke, P. B. "Male Circumcision Decreases Penile Sensitivity as Measured in a Large Cohort". BJU International. (2013) doi: 10.1111/j.1464-410X.2012.11761.x

Fink, K.S., Carson, C.C., DeVellis, R.F. "Adult Circumcision Outcomes Study: Effect on Erectile Function, Penile Sensitivity, Sexual Activity and Satisfaction" The Journal of Urology Vol. 167, Issue 5 (2002): 2113-2116.

Frisch, M., Lindholm, M., Gronbaek, M. "Male Circumcision and Sexual Function in Men and Women: A Survey-based, Cross-sectional Study in Denmark" International Journal of Epidemiology Vol. 40 (2011): 1367 - 1381.

Gemmell, T., & Boyle, G. J. "Neonatal circumcision: Its long-term harmful effects." Understanding Circumcision: A Multi-disciplinary Approach to a Multi-dimensional Problem. Eds. G. C. Denniston, F. M. Hodges, & M. F. Milos. New York: Kluwer/Plenum, 2001. pp.241-252.

Kigozi, G., Watya, S., Polis, C.B., et al. "The Effect of Male Circumcision on Sexual Satisfaction and Function, Results from a Randomized Trial of Male Circumcision for Human Immunodeficiency Virus Prevention, Rakai, Uganda" BJU International Vol. 101, No. 1 (2008): 65-70.

Masood, S., Patel, H.R.H., Himpson, R.C., et. al. "Penile sensitivity and sexual satisfaction after circumcision: are we informing men correctly?" Urologia Internationalis Vol. 75 Iss. 1 (2005): 62-66.

Morris, B.J., Waskett, J.H., Gray, R.H. "Does Sexual Function Survey in Denmark Offer Any Support for Male Circumcision Having an Adverse Effect?" International Journal of Epidemiology Vol. 40 (2011): Published online ahead of print, November 28, 2011.

Sorrells, M.L., Snyder, J.L., Reiss, M.D., et. al. "Fine-touch Pressure Thresholds in the Adult Penis." BJU International Volume 99 (2007): 864-869.

Stats for penile cancer in the United States (very high circumcision rate) and Europe (incredibly low circumcision rate) is less than 1 in 100,000 for lifetime risk. With a number that low, circumcision isn't going to give a statistically significant advantage in prevention. Three hundred and ten will die from it.

<http://www.cancer.org/cancer/penilecancer/detailedguide/penile-cancer-key-statistics>

The life time risk of male breast cancer is 1 in 1,000 (one THOUSAND- not hundred thousand like penile cancer- one THOUSAND). A full hundred more- 410 will die from it. He has a much higher chance of developing male breast cancer and then dying from it than penile cancer (even circumcised), yet, no one would consider removing his breast tissue at birth!

<http://www.cancer.org/cancer/breastcancerinmen/detailedguide/breast-cancer-in-men-key-statistics>

I find it really disturbing when people claim that they've "fully researched" circumcision, yet they still choose to have it done to their child. If you've fully researched circumcision, you know:

-Circumcision was made popular in the U.S. as an anti-masturbation punishment in the Victorian era. Even some Jewish mohels will admit that circumcision is done to control and diminish male sexuality.

-The foreskin has several important protective, sexual, and immunological functions, including protecting the glans (the most sensitive part of the penis), stimulating the G-spot, providing gliding motion that eliminates the need for lube, protecting sexual partners from soreness/irritation, protection from STDs via the Langerhans cells, trapping/releasing pheromones with sexual partners increasing bonding capacity, and more.

-The foreskin contains over 20,000 fine-touch nerve endings. The clitoris contains 8,000.

-The "cleanliness" issue is a myth, because intact men are not dirty. Their penises are just as clean as our intact vulvas.

-The "infection" issue is a myth, because intact men are not more prone to infection. WOMEN get way more infections than intact men. Forced retraction (when the foreskin of a child is wrongly forced back to "clean" underneath-- a huge no-no!!!) is the cause of infections in intact boys and men. NOT the foreskin.

-The STD issue is a myth, because the U.S. has one of the highest circumcision rates and one of the highest STD rates in the world. Circumcised men still contract and spread STDs. The African studies promoting circumcision as HIV prevention are seriously flawed, and HIV rates are actually going up because men believe they have an "invisible condom," which promotes more unsafe sex.

-Circumcision hurts. Babies who "didn't even cry" are experiencing a shock withdrawal response. No pain reducers are effective enough to fully numb the pain of foreskin amputation. And there is no pain relief whatsoever in the following days, when your new baby has an open, raw wound on his penis.

-Circumcision is clearly linked to sexual dysfunction. You cannot change the form of the penis without changing the function, and the foreskin has important sexual functions. There is no way to tell how large an adult penis will grow, so cutting the foreskin off a baby is a guessing game that often leads to painful erections later in life. Many men suffer from having too much foreskin removed (although removing ANY amount of foreskin is taking too much). Some men are "lucky" and still have enough skin for some slack, but some men experience "buried penis" and/or painful erections from lack of skin.

-Scarring, numbness, adhesions, skin bridges, meatal stenosis, and other damage to the penis are common side effects from circumcision.

-Your child is much more likely to experience a negative side effect from circumcision than to ever have a problem being intact.

-Your child is more likely to DIE from circumcision than ever need one later in life. It is incredibly rare for a man to need a circumcision later in life, and those cases are often money-hungry doctors, influenced by tradition.

-Over 100 babies die every year from circumcision in the U.S. alone.

-Some babies lose the head of their penis, or their entire penis, from botched circumcisions. It has

happened before and will happen again.

-The "health benefits" of circumcision are the same as the "health benefits" of removing breast tissue from all baby girls to prevent breast cancer. Or removing the toes from all babies to prevent ingrown toenails. Or cutting the labia off baby girls to prevent urinary tract infections. It's nonsense. It's not medicine. It's an outdated, unnecessary surgery that started as a blood sacrifice to various gods.

-Most men around the world are intact, and most cultures think circumcision is a bizarre, barbaric, harmful procedure.

-"Matching daddy" as a reason for circumcision makes as much sense as breast implants for a little girl so she can "match mommy." The vast majority of grown men do not remember what their father's penis looks like.

-Circumcision is a multi-million dollar industry. Foreskins are sold to cosmetic companies for profit, to be used in skin creams. Medical trade organizations like the American Academy of Pediatrics have a conflict of interest because they benefit financially from circumcision.

-No medical organization in the world recommends routine infant circumcision. The AAP and the WHO promote some of the myths discussed here, but still fall short of recommending it for all babies, because they have not fully studied the risks, and the "benefits" are minimal. Their members also profit financially from circumcision, thus their opinion is tainted.

So... if you know all that, why would you choose it? If you are fully informed, how could you? Why would you risk your child's life for something not only unnecessary, but harmful? If you are really, truly, FULLY informed, you don't. You just don't. -Kristen

This is about circumcision. It is from the Book of Mormon, therefore it was written and preserved for OUR TIME specifically. There is no disputing this if you have a testimony:

Book of Mormon, Moroni, Chapter 8 Verses 4; 6-8

<http://lds.org/scriptures/bofm/moro/8.4.6.7.8?lang=eng>

4 And now, my son, I speak unto you concerning that which grieveth me exceedingly; for it grieveth me that there should disputations rise among you...

6 And now, my son, I desire that ye should labor diligently, that this gross error should be removed from among you; for, for this intent I have written this epistle.

7 For immediately after I had learned these things of you I inquired of the Lord concerning the matter. And the word of the Lord came to me by the power of the Holy Ghost, saying:

8 Listen to the words of Christ, your Redeemer, your Lord and your God. Behold, I came into the world not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance; the whole need no physician, but they that are sick; wherefore, little children are whole, for they are not capable of committing sin; wherefore the curse of Adam is taken from them in me, that it hath no power over them; and the law of circumcision is done away in me.

Myth: Uncircumcised boys get more urinary tract infections (UTIs.)

Reality check: This claim is based on one study that looked at charts of babies born in one hospital (Wiswell 1985). The study had many problems, including that it didn't accurately count whether or not the babies were circumcised, whether they were premature and thus more susceptible to infection in general, whether they were breastfed (breastfeeding protects against UTI), and if their foreskins had been forcibly retracted (which can introduce harmful bacteria and cause UTI) (Pisacane 1990). There have been many studies since which show either no decrease in UTI with circumcision, or else an increase in UTI from circumcision. Thus circumcision is not recommended to prevent UTI (Thompson 1990). Girls have higher rates of UTI than boys, and yet when a girl gets a UTI, she is simply prescribed antibiotics. The same treatment works for boys.

Myth: Circumcision prevents HIV/AIDS.

Reality check: Three studies in Africa several years ago that claimed that circumcision prevented AIDS and that circumcision was as effective as a 60% effective vaccine (Auvert 2005, 2006). These studies had many flaws, including that they were stopped before all the results came in. There have also been several studies that show that circumcision does not prevent HIV (Connolly 2008). There are many issues at play in the spread of STDs which make it very hard to generalize results from one population to another.

In Africa, where the recent studies have been done, most HIV transmission is through male-female sex, but in the USA, it is mainly transmitted through blood exposure (like needle sharing) and male-male sex. Male circumcision does not protect women from acquiring HIV, nor does it protect men who have sex with men (Wawer 2009, Jameson 2009).

What's worse, because of the publicity surrounding the African studies, men in Africa are now starting to believe that if they are circumcised, they do not need to wear condoms, which will increase the spread of HIV (Westercamp 2010). Even in the study with the most favorable effects of circumcision, the protective effect was only 60% - men would still have to wear condoms to protect themselves and their partners from HIV.

In the USA, during the AIDS epidemic of the 1980s and 90s, about 85% of adult men were circumcised (much higher rates of circumcision than in Africa), and yet HIV still spread.

It is important to understand, too, that the men in the African studies were adults and they volunteered for circumcision. Babies undergoing circumcision were not given the choice to decide for themselves.

Myth: Circumcision is worth it because it can save lives.

Reality check: Consider breast cancer: There is a 12% chance that a woman will get breast cancer in her lifetime. Removal of the breast buds at birth would prevent this, and yet no one would advocate doing this to a baby. It is still considered somewhat shocking when an adult woman chooses to have a prophylactic mastectomy because she has the breast cancer gene, yet this was a personal choice done based upon a higher risk of cancer. The lifetime risk of acquiring HIV is less than 2% for men, and can be lowered to near 0% through condom-wearing (Hall 2008). How, then, can we advocate prophylactic circumcision for baby boys?

Science and data do not support the practice of infant circumcision. Circumcision does not preclude the use of the condom. The adult male should have the right to make the decision for himself and not have his body permanently damaged as a baby.

Does male circumcision reduce the risk of cervical cancer in their female partners?

A 2002 paper in the New England Journal of Medicine studied men in Europe, Asia, and Latin America, and found that circumcision was correlated with a decreased risk of penile HPV infection (this correlation is corroborated by a 2009 study in African men), but that there was not a significant correlation between circumcision and incidence of cervical cancer.

When they restricted their dataset to women with only one sexual partner, there was an increased risk of cervical cancer in women whose partners were uncircumcised only if their partner was already considered at high risk for contracting HPV (as determined by age at first intercourse, number of sexual partners, and sex with prostitutes). So, in men who already engage in risky sexual behavior, circumcision does offer an advantage for protecting their partners from cervical cancer.

A more recent paper published this year in The Lancet studied HIV negative men and their partners in Africa, circumcising half of the men immediately and the other half after 2 years. Their female partners were tested for high risk genotypes of HPV that are known to cause cervical cancer at the beginning of the study, as well as 1 year and 2 years afterwards.

After controlling for lifestyle variables, the women partnered with men who were circumcised had significantly reduced rates of infection with both low and high risk HPV genotypes. However, the women in this study were overwhelmingly monogamous (only 4% of female participants had more than one sexual partner in the year prior to the study), so the results cannot be extrapolated to women with multiple sexual partners.

A woman that has assisted in hundreds of Routine infant circumcisions has opened up a Q&A, and will answer any question on Mommas with Boys: get the real truth.

Question that was asked- "Did babies ever seem calm or like they weren't in pain? Or was it clearly the baby in shock or screaming?"

"Mommas with Boys: get the real truth.: Erin, yes I have seen those babies. To be honest on one hand it's such a relief because its heartbreaking every single time. On the other hand we actually pay closer attention to that baby because they are in shock. They are sweaty and pale, they are clearly in distress although it appears peaceful and painless. We tell the mother that they slept through the circumcision and she doesn't ever know about the blood curdling screams her tiny struggling baby made BEFORE he "went to sleep". That just sounds nicer than he went into shock and stopped responding to all stimulus. Plus, if we told the mothers, they'd instantly know how horrible it was for their baby. I don't think the doctors would get many repeat customers if we were allowed to tell the truth. Only a doctor is legally allowed to give information about what really happened in that room. They never, ever do. The doctors are numb to the procedure. None of them liked or looked forward to doing circumcisions. But I only know of a few OB's that never did them. Now I know why. ~Jeni"