

ACORN

Issue
N^o 1 2001
Editor
Steve Acorn

Editorial

Well finally here is the first issue for the year 2001. It's late, partly because I have been very busy, but also due to a continuing shortage of contributions. Thanks to all of you who have sent in contributions and to all of those who wrote in asking when the next issue was due out, how about sending a contribution instead? It would enable it to be produced far more quickly.

The spring meeting had to be cancelled due to not enough people having booked by the cutoff date we had to give the hotel. Unfortunately, by the weekend itself, just about enough additional people had expressed an interest in coming that the weekend could have probably gone ahead after all. Please, if you want to come to the weekends, do let us know as soon as possible, even if it is only a provisional booking. We are hoping that the next weekend will be held over the weekend 2nd/3rd November – most probably somewhere to the north/west of London. More details will follow nearer the time.

Steve Acorn

Contents

		Page
Editorial	Steve	1
My Experience	Peter	2
Kiwi Confidante	K.G.	3
Have You Ever Wondered?	E.T.	4
Second Instalment	S.J.	5
Circumcision Problems	Anon	7
Disadvantage Of 'Muslim' Style Of Circumcision	S.M.	9
Prince Albert?	Gary	10
Response To 'Prince Albert?'	Vernon	10
Book Review	W.	11
Recollections	C.N.	12
Jealous?	Jim	13
Cut Puppeteers	Will	14
Reflections On A Theme	Anon	15
Too Clean	K.G.	16
Circumcision Festival	David	16

© 2001 The Acorn Society & Contributors

Correspondence

Please send all correspondence to:-

THE ACORN SOCIETY
P.O. BOX 296
IPSWICH
IP2 8SH

Letters for forwarding should be marked with the recipient's identifier in pencil. They should be stamped 1st class and enclosed in an envelope addressed as above.

E-Mail may be sent to: acornsoc@aol.com

My Experience

As a relatively new member of *Acorn*, I have read the various articles in the last few newsletters with immense interest. Again and again I have agreed so much with the various experiences of other circumcised men that I feel I must write even if my own history mirrors so many others. Like I.D. (Sussex), in the sixties I attended a school where swimming sessions were done in the nude. The main differences being that: (a) the school was all-male and (b) it was absolutely compulsory for all boys to participate in swimming lessons. It wasn't deemed liberal or trendy but viewed as a way of knocking modesty out of shy, largely middle-class schoolboys – probably a hangover from the days of National Service.

Needless to say, this gave me my first real sight of a variety of cocks of all shapes and sizes. The larger they were, the more they were sniggered at. How naïve we were – now I bet most of us would give our eye-teeth for one that was as big as some (very lucky) lads possessed. But I was utterly fascinated by the boys who sported circumcised cocks. There was no desire to conform to the majority as these boys were in the minority. Nor was it a feeling of being in the 'elite', even though it became increasingly clear to me that these boys largely came from well-educated, reasonably affluent families. It was the working class pupils, like myself, who still were intact. I felt no envy for their social status at all, but just longed to be circumcised. If you think it was simple snobbery, this was definitely not the case. To me, a circumcised cock has always looked overwhelmingly more attractive than an uncut one.

The intensity of my yearning grew and I longed to have permanently the bare glans of my circumcised brethren. I became so disenchanted with my hated foreskin that I made no attempt whatsoever to involve myself in any sort of sexual relationship even when I was at University in the seventies. I so hated the foreskin I was still attached to, I couldn't bear anyone to see it. Sex became a solo effort with any attempt I could make to keep my cock-head uncovered for as long as possible. I couldn't even talk about my hang-up with anyone, particularly my parents who would have found my enthusiasm for circumcision quite beyond their comprehension.

With my father's death when I was twenty-three, I suddenly became the 'man of the house'. Now I decided that I had to act like a man and stop being so apprehensive of the thought of an adult circumcision. I realised there was no hope of getting it done on the NHS, but found an advert for a private clinic about 12 miles from home. I rang them and found that they would do the operation, under local anaesthetic, in a couple of days' time. I booked a date and was told that if I didn't turn up, I would still be charged. With this thought there was little chance of not going.

It still took some courage to make my way to the clinic that afternoon. As keen as I was, I was a little worried about how painful it might be afterwards.

But once I arrived, everything went through very quickly. I was pleased to be circumcised under a local, though I wasn't brave enough to watch. I just lay back and thought of England. The sense of relief when it was over was overwhelming. It was like a huge weight off my mind. The next couple of weeks were going to be uncomfortable, but I didn't care – I had done it!

Once the wound had healed and my cock assumed its new shape, I couldn't wait to try it out. I'd been told to wait for four weeks after the op before trying any form of sexual activity. This wait was absolute torture – even walking to the station in the morning would give me a raging hard-on. But when the four weeks were up, that night I began a very tentative jack-off session. Once I could see there was going to be no opening up of the scar I carried on with vigorous abandon. My first postoperative orgasm was an event I will remember for the rest of my days. I think the expression is 'fan-bloody-tastic'.

Admittedly, a few months later, I did have a secondary op or 'trimming' as the same surgeon who did the first, called it. This included the removal of most of my frenulum. This tightening up procedure made things even better as a taut shaft gives greatly enhanced sexual pleasure.

Like R.F.W., my fascination with circumcision has never abated over the twenty years since I was cut. My best friend was also circumcised in his twenties and we have often discussed how we feel about it and both agree that although in the minority in this country, we are very lucky that we are roundheads. My pleasure for sex is still undimmed since that night four weeks after I was circumcised. The enjoyment of the erotic head-rub every time I have an erection has never diminished. Similarly to R.F.W., I also have to sneak a peak at other men in sports changing rooms, to see if any are as fortunate as I am. I never say anything to those who are, but deep down I always feel a kind of kinship to them.

Although I was not as fortunate to be well-circumcised like the guys cut in infancy I feel that at least most of my adult life has been spent with my 'true' status. It may not be the greatest circumcision in the world, but God do I love it!

Should anyone wish to contact me, the Society had my address and email address. I would be pleased to hear from anyone else.

Peter

Kiwi Confidante

I feel I ought to report a recent, interesting conversation I had with a young New Zealand man in a London sauna. My Kiwi confidante remarked that his definitive opinion on Britain was the positive plethora of prepuces present! He was uncircumcised and thought that 'general' circumcision was ended around 20 years ago but he did state categorically that most Antipodean men

remain in favour of a tightly-cut penis. He was plainly happy to have kept his long foreskin but applauded the pendulous foreskins of his British compatriots. I, as an admirer of circumcised penises, still felt (wrongly) that Aussies and New Zealander men were 'cut'. My illusions have been shattered...

K.G. - London

Have You Ever Wondered?

At the age of 7 or 8 I was fascinated by the difference of appearance of the circumcised penis to the foreskinned version, observed from playing the nurses and doctors games of childhood.

As I grew up the subject of circumcision was still of keen interest as I continued to learn and read more from as many sources as could be found, and during all this period I wanted desperately to be circumcised.

However, I was not to achieve this until I was 35, with a revision at 38 – but that is another story.

The question I have pondered all these years, and am no closer to finding an answer “Why and who first thought of performing this operation on the male appendage?”

We read that the practice probably pre-dated Egyptian times and was possibly performed in other parts of Africa in prehistory.

The Jewish people adopted the practice from the time Abraham was commanded by God to circumcise his son and all the males of the tribe. The Muslims also look upon Abraham as one of the great prophets, and perhaps they took up the practice from the same time. I assume this, but must say that I am no historian, religious or otherwise, nor do I claim to have any academic qualification in human studies or anthropology.

My point is, why cut off the foreskin, as a 'badge' or mark of belonging to a group or clan, when that mark is not likely to be seen beneath clothing? Why this permanent and final act, rather than do something that can be seen and recognised by all?

Was the foreskin seen as something that could be removed without altering the function of the person/penis? (I know this comment will provoke some indignation.) Why not snip off the ear lobe; file the teeth; put a bone through the nose or lip, all of which would mark the person with his 'badge' of clan for all to see?

It occurs to me that the practice was never a medical procedure, but has its roots in self adornment/mutilation – dependent on your point of view.

Yet it does not answer the long pondered question – “why and when was circumcision first performed?”

I do not expect the question will ever be answered and I shall just go on wondering (and enjoying my cut cock and the sight of others!)

E.T. - Essex

Second Instalment

I am writing to complete the second instalment of my first letter (third time lucky?) from the last issue. In that one I explained how I came to be circumcised, the operations and the results. This time I'm going to relate some of the most circy-interesting experiences.

However, before I start I'd just like to say how comforting it is to find letters from other people with a similar interest in circumcision, and how easy it was to identify with R.F.W. - Surrey and his "life long compulsion to be circumcised.". And I thought I was the only one!

So, back to the post-op stories. After I'd been cut the second time, the glans was bared except on top where a roll of skin just lipped annoyingly over the rim. I couldn't wait to try it out with females, hoping they would notice. I went to some massage parlours for an 'intimate massage', but the 3 girls who wanked me off hadn't got a clue about circumcision, and I don't think they even knew what it was. I was pretty disappointed, and longed either for one to say how sexy she found my naked knob, or to be even more tightly circumcised so that there would be no doubt.

Then I started going out with quite a voluptuous sexpot, and surprise surprise she absolutely loved the circumcision. The third time we screwed we were lying in bed and she gently ran her finger along my cock and over the knob. She said, "Do you mind if I ask you a personal question?... Have you been operated on?" She was delighted as I proudly showed her the scar and explained how the operation had been done. She really got off on it, but unfortunately has been the only Spanish girl to have "been in to it" or recognized it. Maybe because the rate of circumcision is so low. A quick check and knob count around the changing rooms of a sports club I go to gives me anything in the region of 10%-15%, which I find rather high, and maybe due to the unrepresentative sample. The typical circumcision leaves a very thin band of pink inner skin just behind the glans. (Tight) Cocks with the cuff of inner skin pulled back are few and far between.

After finally getting my third cut, my cock definitely looked more like a roundhead although it falls in line with the typically circumcised Spanish cock described above. Despite the closer cut, I've had no more accurate 'sightings' from either 'massage' girls or girlfriends, although many of the call-girls tend to whip out the creams without asking, so they must notice something. One of the nicest wanks I got was from one who applied baby oil

and rubbed her thumb up and down on the frenulum while simultaneously gently 'squeezing' the skin up and down which was nice.

One of the problems I have is that when the skin is pulled up to its maximum, (about half way up the knob), the skin over the right hand testicle is pulled so tight that it is painful. When I come, the testicle almost seems to 'disappear' into the shaft of my cock. This happens especially in cold weather. Have any other tightly circumcised members had similar problems.

Anyway, after being frustrated with girls' reactions I finally had to know what it was like to wank another guy's cut cock. Girls on USA porn films never seem to do it right, always sucking and never giving the cut cock a good jerking with the skin. (My particular interest is how far the skin can be pulled up the circumcised cock when erect. I'd appreciate members adding this info in their letters.)

So, I eventually found a 'sauna' specialising in transvestites (I couldn't face a 'real' man!). I was nervous, but finally felt I was sure enough about my sexuality to accept what I was going to do. Sitting in a bedroom a procession of 'girls' were sent in one by one. I asked each one if he was cut, and in most cases they didn't know what I meant. Out of about 9 or 10, 2 admitted to being circed. I picked one and we went into a bedroom complete with gay porno vids on a TV. As soon as he pulled down his knickers I knew I made the right choice. It was one of the most beautiful cocks I'd ever seen; so clearly circumcised. We both got undressed and got on the bed. I made an immediate inspection. The cock was about average size, and when flaccid there was about 2 inches of inner skin pulled back down the shaft. There was no hint of a scar or 'thread' of frenulum. And despite being so cut the glans didn't have a particularly prominent rim. Asking for the method, he was reportedly circumcised by his mother when he was 4 years old (he was Brazilian), and according to him this is quite common. I find it hard to believe, but may be plausible in poor working class families who couldn't pay for the operation. Still, hats off to mum who did a clean job, and left an object of envy for circers everywhere.

He let me wank him and I was surprised how supple the skin was, and fully erect I was able to pull the skin just over the rim of the cock. He said he didn't have any sensitive spots but seemed to enjoy the baby-oil wank and the twisting wrist method over the knob. I wasn't allowed to bring him off since he had to 'last' through the night, which was a shame, however he politely brought me off. My 'technical' interest must have shown since he said "you prefer women don't you." I said I did, but my 'fetish' is now undeniably confirmed. I haven't felt like going back (my curiosity was satisfied thankfully), but I'm glad I had the experience I 'missed' when I was growing up.

Now alone and single again, I'm weighing up the 4th and definitive tight circ. I know I'm obsessed, but at least I now know I'm not the only one.

S.J.

Circumcision Problems

After reading the article 'Growing Up with and Acroposthion' Issue 2/2000 it brought to mind a number of points that I have found disturbing concerning circumcision.

Why is it that in conversation many people find circumcision a humorous subject and enjoy making fun of the procedure and to some extent the men who have been circumcised. I know many of the jokes relate to the Jews who bear the brunt of the humour like the Irish and Polish do in other areas. However it never ceases to amaze me how many people find the whole topic funny even when the procedure is carried out for other than religious reasons. Is it because circumcision is considered a subject of ridicule in many circles that many men who are circumcised tend not to discuss it and it has this 'not to be talked about' stigma? I know from experience that a lot of women find the idea of circumcision a real laugh and this can cause embarrassment if you are singled out in a group in a pub or other venue for some 'cutting' comments and sniggers. It seems strange that other operations: eg tonsillectomy, appendectomy etc are accepted with little or no comment while circumcision always raises a laugh; consider the number of comedians on the television and some of the comedy soap type programmes that look for a laugh when someone has been circumcised or is to be circumcised.

When I was born in 1948 it was a 50/50 chance you would be circumcised; it was 'fashionable' and found favour with many parents although there was frequently no medical reason for it. I was only a few weeks old when I was circumcised; not a very good job and I decided in later life, because my semi-circumcised state was causing problems, to get the job done properly. There was little ridicule at my school as around 40% to 50% of the boys in my year were circumcised and although boys were classed as roundheads or cavaliers it did not amount to much and problems concerning the state of your penis were few.

I went to a mixed secondary school before the big comprehensive schools were formed. Consequently there were a lot of smallish schools which meant there were numerous inter-school competitions; football, athletics, cricket etc. I was particularly good at athletics (100yds, 220yds, long jump etc) which meant I was always in the school athletics team. There was one large borough meeting a year but there were numerous inter-school meets between my school and one of the many others. It was at one of these small events against a minor public school when I first noticed that problems could be encountered by boys depending upon their circumcised state. After the athletics match was over we went back into the changing rooms; our school changing rooms were divided into two pads and it was usual for each team to change etc on separate sides; but the showers were shared and both sides met up in them. All the boys from the public school were circumcised except one who was

slightly younger than the majority but was reasonably good at his event. He had a particularly long foreskin and was constantly picked on (I suppose it was bullying) by the other boys in his team and it was obvious from the things that were said and the antics his penis was subjected to that his cavalier status was the problem. I must say we met that school on a number of occasions and although he came in for considerable ragging he remained a cavalier and I assume he still is. That was the position 40 years ago.

Moving on to the present the boot is now on the other foot. When my daughter was six she went to a local Friday club for children aged 5 to 9. Eventually as I had to travel some distance to the club and I ferried a number of other children to it I was roped in to help. One evening the lady group leader mentioned that a few of the boys were missing and had been gone for a little while longer than was usual. We soon discovered the boys were in the toilets. The club was held in an old building and as is common with this type of building the toilets were outside the back in a small block. When I entered the toilet block I found one small boy had been debagged and was being tormented by the other boys who were laughing at and poking fun at his circumcised penis. It was obvious that the boy had only recently been circumcised as his penis looked quite red and sore. I was to learn later that this boy and another lad who also came to the club had gone into hospital at the same time; the tormented boy had had what I can only say looked like a fairly radical circumcision that is his glans was totally exposed as the foreskin had been cut back hard and the cut line (it was not really a scar at this time) was well up the penis shaft; the other boy, whose father was absolutely against him being circumcised, had just had his foreskin stretched and been given instructions to frequently work the foreskin back and forth over the glans to keep it loose. I suppose as this boy did not look any different he was not considered worth bullying although he was actually less robust than the other boy. As far as I am aware the stretching exercise was a success as I never heard that this boy needed any additional treatment. The boy who had been circumcised was the only boy in the small primary school to have had the operation and although I understand the teasing etc reduced I am sure it made him very self conscious.

Another instance when a circumcised boy came in for some bullying was told to me by a mother who worked with me. She had had a few of days off work because her son of 11 had to go into hospital for a circumcision; I understand this was considered to be necessary on medical grounds. From the somewhat graphic detail the mother went into concerning the result of the operation it appears that rather more skin was removed than was perhaps prudent as the wound was taking longer to heal than she thought would be the case and the boy had to see the GP/nurse on a couple of occasions after discharge from hospital. From the way she was speaking I believe the GP had given her to understand that only a slight nip at the end of the foreskin would be necessary whereas the hospital doctor, so it seems, had removed

considerably more and left the lad with a totally exposed glans and very tight shaft skin. She did say that she was very surprised at the extent of the operation but she assumed it was for the best. Anyway back at school the boy came in for some nasty teasing which lasted for sometime and he is still the brunt of some ragging although I believe this has subsided somewhat. Again this boy is also one of very few in the school who has had the operation.

I understand that these days circumcision is now only carried out on 1% to 2% of boys as today's thinking considers the foreskin should be retained. I am sure, in the majority of cases, any tightness of the foreskin is restricted to the tip; why is it then that instead of just the tip being removed or perhaps a slit being made in the tip, surgeons still insist on removing the skin right back behind the helmet and frequently some way up the shaft. I know I had problems with my penis requiring further attention but I am sure I am in the minority and most men would not need further surgery.

It would be interesting to read/hear from others whether they have any views on my comments, particularly the younger ones born say in the 1960s onwards.

Anon

Disadvantage Of 'Muslim' Style Of Circumcision

Your correspondents P.T. and R.F.W. both extol the delights of what they call the 'Muslim' style of circumcision with the inside of the foreskin stretched up the shaft of the penis so that the scar line is well back from the glans. I cannot comment on whether this is really typical of Muslim cuts (the only one of which I've seen close up was not like that but had a faint scar just behind the glans) but I do think your readers should be made aware of a major potential disadvantage of this style of cut.

As Vernon correctly pointed out in the same issue, there is increasing evidence that circumcision offers partial (and I emphasise *partial*) protection against HIV transmission. In fact there are now dozens of studies that have consistently found that men without foreskins are less likely to contract the virus than those with. So compelling is the evidence that even the BBC documentary programme *Horizon* devoted an episode to the topic recently. It has become clear that one of the main mechanisms by which the virus gains entry to a man from a woman is through the inner surface of the foreskin. This surface lacks the protective layer of keratin found on the outer surface of the foreskin, and on the shaft and glans (whether circumcised or not) of the penis. In addition, the inner surface of the foreskin is rich in Langerhans' cells which are especially prone to HIV infection. These cells are not present elsewhere on the penis. The frenulum is another vulnerable point as it is susceptible to minute tears.

As it is now apparent that the inner foreskin is the Achilles heel of the penis it would seem prudent to remove as much of it (and the frenulum) as possible during a circumcision leaving the scar line as close to the glans as possible. A circumcision that left the inner foreskin intact, but spread out along the shaft, would seem unlikely to confer as much benefit with respect to reducing viral transmission. Indeed, differing styles of circumcision may even explain why studies have found so much variation in the effectiveness of the procedure at reducing HIV infection.

I might add that, in my experience, (circumcised by choice aged 30, scar 1 cm behind the glans) the small bit of remaining inner foreskin is rather prone to friction burns in the event of over-enthusiastic masturbation. I certainly would not want any more of it to have been kept. Nevertheless, like every man I know who's been cut as an adult for whatever reason, I am thrilled with the result and would not want my foreskin back even if it were possible.

I appreciate that HIV prevention may not have been the primary intention of your correspondents when they had their operations (and I wish them years of safe joy with their redesigned organs) but should certainly be borne in mind by anyone considering a circumcision for themselves, or their children.

Finally, I am not a medical doctor but the above does seem self-evident. The comments of your medically qualified readers would be most welcome.

S.M. - Cheshire

Prince Albert?

Any remarks on 'Another Prince Albert'? Yes, once and for all, Prince Albert did not have his cock pierced and neither did any other member of the royal family called Prince Albert. Queen Victoria's consort wore a watch chain, which became known as an 'Albert'. The word is in the dictionary and is used by many Victorian and Edwardian writers including H.G. Wells. The ridiculous story that Prince Albert had his cock tethered to his leg by a chain is of very recent origin.

Gary - London

Response To 'Prince Albert?'

It would be very strange for a penis ring to be called a 'Prince Albert' without some connection to one of the many Royal personages bearing that name. One story, purporting to be true, was recounted way back in Issue 4/88 by John McC. Another plausible theory relates to using the ring to hold the penis down the trouser leg by linking it to a garter so as to prevent unwanted erections from showing in the tight trousers fashionable at the time.

Vernon - London

Book Review

Circumcision: A History of the World's Most Controversial Surgery by David L Gollaher.

Over the years there have been many publications, some old others more recent, mentioned in the pages of the *Acorn* magazine and in some ways connected with the topic of Circumcision. These have all approached the subject either by medical, sexual, ritual or customary ways. However, this last Christmas, I received a copy of this book as a gift from an American pen-pal, (he is also a member of *Acorn*).

David Gollaher received Master's and Ph.D. degrees from Harvard University, further, he is President and Chief Executive Officer of the California Health Care Institute, a public policy group of leading biomedical research companies and universities. This book is just what the title suggests it to be, a history of the operation of Circumcision. It starts with the first known reference to the operation, that of a Egyptian tomb engraving dating from 2400 B.C., and continues through to the present day controversy over the practice. The book covers the Jewish ritual, the Moslem custom and makes mention of the practice in other parts of the world including the Australian Aboriginal and African tribal customs. Detailed accounts and statistics are given. The author writes in an easy, tactful and natural way, and giving many references; there is no obvious bias for or against the procedure. That, in reporting on more recent statements, statistics are given which are contradictory is drawn by the author to the attention of the reader. The book is well annotated.

In this book the author draws conclusions that, I am sure, will interest *Acorn* readers. In referring to the medical aspects of the procedure he reports that the variance between the two groups was negligible, but that the same could not be said of their sex lives, e.g. "We find that circumcised men engage in a more elaborate set of sexual practices" and "It makes no health difference whether you are or are not circumcised but you will 'get around' more if you are". A further quotation may bring a smile, "Ironically, in the light of the old theory that the foreskin encouraged masturbation, circumcised men were found to be more prone to masturbation". The study concluded that, on average, circumcised men engage in heterosexual oral and anal sex and homosexual acts more commonly than their uncircumcised peers.

This book, published in hard back format and running to 250 pages, retails in the United States at \$20. The ISBN number is 0-465-04397-6. If you intend to purchase a copy it would be wise to establish the cost before you make a commitment, the notional \$20 = £15 may not apply. The publishers offer further information from Basic Books, 10 East 53rd Street, New York, NY 10022-5299. Direct purchase may be possible.

W. - Dorset

Recollections

I just love the circumcised state and would like to see all men and boys circumcised. I first saw a circumcised cock when I was about 8 years old. On the way home from school we crossed some open fields where a group of us sat and talked. One day Dave, a boy who later became a very close friend, pulled his cock out to show that he was different from the other 3 or 4 boys with us. I remember being fascinated by the smooth head, of which he seemed so proud. Years later as 13 year olds we used to wank off together and by then he was really big and his circumcised cock looked fabulous. Although he seemed bigger than me he was often telling me how big I was and especially how thick my shaft was. The only thing he did not like was the fact that I was uncircumcised. He told me that every Saturday afternoon he wanked off with an older boy who was also circumcised and really huge. I have always regretted not getting together with the two of them and I think that the only thing stopping me was my uncircumcised condition. Though only 8 of the 30 boys in my school class were circumcised I somehow had 3 of those boys in my close circle of 4 friends. I can still remember exactly the boys who were circumcised and even what their cocks looked like although I cannot remember more than a few of the others. Even at home I seemed to be in the company of the few circumcised boys in the neighbourhood and can remember wanking off with 4 of them but only with 2 uncircumcised boys. Wanking with the circumcised boys was fantastic and I especially remember Trevor who was a year younger than me who liked to see which of the two of us could shoot our loads the quicker. Years later I heard from another boy that Trevor used to suck him off swallowing all his huge load of cum. I just regret that he never did that for me but of course at the time I was uncircumcised and the thought of sucking an uncircumcised penis must surely put anyone off.

How much more is relevant? Dave (not the same one as above) with whom I used to wank off instead of doing games at school had one of the biggest cocks I have seen even at age 14 and was in my view perfectly circumcised. Or Tony who I met at University who really did have the biggest cock I have seen and flaunted his circumcision which was superb and without even a visible trace of a scar which is how I like to see them, but I suppose that only happens if you are done at birth. I always had the feeling that like me he was bisexual but he used to go on so much about 'queers' that I did not dare to show any interest in his magnificent cock. Or should I describe the fun I had in the local disused quarry with Peter, a neighbour who had quite a small but well circumcised cock who liked to strip naked so that we could better enjoy mutual masturbation.

All these boys and many others convinced me that one day I too would be happily circumcised.

C.N. - Cardiff

Jealous?

There is no doubt about it: the ideal holiday is a flotilla sailing trip in the Med. You can either hire a whole boat or just one bunk if you don't mind who your companions will be. Since the sailing fraternity is the cream of British society, I was very happy to take 'pot luck' and finished up in a six-berth boat with three younger chaps and a pretty divorcee in her thirties. I was by far the oldest and, being the only experienced sailor, was duly elected skipper, the girl volunteering to cook. As soon as we were out of sight of land one of the lads said that if I didn't mind, they were going to strip off. The girl had no objection but said she'd only go topless, being the only girl – and with that I found myself with a bollock-naked crew and a bare-breasted cook! Now, I'm no prude, heaven knows, but I do find nudity rather unsettling. The problem is that although I'm a fairly well-balanced individual (chip on both shoulders, according to my ex-wife). I've never been able to come to terms with the altered appearance and sense of deprivation of having a circumcised cock and am consequently desperately shy of showing it. I suspected the three lads would be uncircumcised since it's not the vogue these days, and so it turned out. They and the girl had probably never seen a circumcised cock in their lives and they weren't going to start with mine! So I declared, amidst boos and cries of 'Spoilsport' that I'd keep my trunks on 'so as not to show them up'. (Har har.)

Shortly afterwards there occurred what proved to be one of the most sexually provoking and yet disturbing episodes I can remember. We'd anchored well out after a fantastic lunchtime session on local wine. Two of the lads and I crashed out in our bunks whilst the girl said she would go on deck and get her norks brown. The other lad also went up to sunbathe.

After half an hour or so I had to get up to use the 'heads' and glanced idly out of the gap in the unlatched porthole whilst pointing Percy at the porcelain, to find myself admiring from close-up the lovely big breasts of the girl who was snoozing with her back against the mast. At that moment the lad came up and, leaning over her, started securing some flapping halyards further up the mast. I had a grandstand view as his sleek brown dick flopped about in front of her face and, seeing how his foreskin tapered to a narrow spout like an elephant's trunk, pondered sadly on my parents' inconsiderate act in depriving me of mine. At that moment the girl opened her eyes and said, 'if you don't stop waving that sausage at me I'll take a bite out of it.' He just laughed and went on with his task, whereupon she reached her hand out and started gently batting his prick from side to side. She stopped fiddling with his ropes and looked down with a lecherous grin on his face as his prick rose rapidly and jerkily to full stretch. It was noticeable that although his foreskin expanded sideways to accommodate his hugely swollen glans, throwing it into sharp relief through the skin, it retreated hardly at all down the shaft, so that the knob remained fully covered with the pendant rope of skin wagging

about on the end. The girl appeared to find this interesting and, daintily seizing the loose tip of his foreskin between thumb and forefinger, started pulling it out so as to check its length. "Your foreskin's a bit long," she said, "We'll have to have you circumcised." "I've never seen a circumcised cock," said the lad, "would it be an improvement?" The girl said her ex-husband had been circumcised and she doubted if it would be an improvement, but if he wanted she'd show him what a circumcised cock looked like and proceeded to slide the narrow tube of skin right back over his knob and down his shaft, concertina-ing it against his balls and leaving the blood red knob and foreskin lining totally exposed. He shivered. "Wow!," said the lad, "you could do that all day, but what's the point of circumcision anyway" She told him that it was easier to keep clean but other than that, there wasn't much to say for it. He'd lose a lot of feeling and make it more difficult for a girl to 'do her duty'. "What's that?" he said whereupon she stretched his foreskin forward over his glans and, cupping his balls in her other hand, she commenced a slow lascivious wank, pulling the skin all the way from the base of his stomach over and beyond his knob. His eyes shut his face went red and his knees started to buckle as he gasped with pleasure. She stopped to let him recover, and then slowly recommenced, massaging his fat knob through the skin. After twenty minutes of keeping him on a knife-edge of delight, she leaned forward and gripped the tip of his foreskin between her lips. As he groaned and shuddered into climax, her hand movement increased to a blur and she took the whole of his penis head into her mouth, collecting his sperm as it spurted from him and then milking and sucking the last drops from his long foreskin like a baby sucking a teat. She quickly spat it overside and, patting his cock, said, "I wouldn't find that so easy if you were circumcised, and you wouldn't enjoy it so much either." I don't think he even heard her, he just sighed rapturously and stretched out next to her, ecstatically squeezing his wet, swollen prick.

Jealous? Believe me, I've had some sexual experience over the years, but it's scenes like that which bring home to me how much I'm missing. It's not just the loss in quality of response in not having the thrill of a mobile foreskin: I'm sure I'd have got a lot of enjoyment out of such treatment, even without a foreskin. It's simply that my damned shyness over revealing my denuded penis would never let me get into such a situation!

Jim

Cut Puppeteers

I wonder if any other members went to see *Puppetry of the Penis* at the Whitehall Theatre recently. I couldn't resist the prospect of seeing two Ozzies with their kit off!

JF comments in Issue 4 of 2000 about the versatility of their cocks; but I think their act was even more remarkable because I am sure that they were

both CUT. One had a tight cut, no doubt about that. The other had a little more skin, but it did not intrude over the glans and it was he who managed to stretch what he had into many different shapes including the Eiffel Tower! Most bizarre, but a good laugh too. Just wish I could have got a closer look.

On another matter, I have been considering having a revision job in order to tighten things up considerably and would be glad to hear by email (in the first instance) any guys who can answer one or two sensitive questions about 'after the event'. Also any recommended surgeons (I have already had a word with the Dr in Golders Green, but would like to check out elsewhere first).

Will

Reflections On A Theme

I guess that it is in the nature of things that in a self-recruiting organisation, and an organisation that embraces an emotive topic, there will be a polarity of opinion and that those at one or other end of the scale may promote their opinion with missionary zeal. I am told that passion dims reason, be that as it may, passion certainly appears to allow one member to accuse another of redefining medical terminology whilst overlooking that he is guilty of the same misdemeanour (*Acorn* 4/2000 'Response to Issue 3/2000'). I suggest that Phimosis is not 'a tight foreskin' nor is it 'a foreskin that is too tight' rather it is a foreskin that cannot be retracted due to a narrowed preputial ring. This, I read, is a rare condition and likely to involve not more than 1.5% of the male population at 17 years of age. ^{(1) (2)}

Whether or not it is deplorable for Drs Lane and South to determine no action on patients with Phimosis depends on the agreement between the doctor and the patient and on the degree of Phimosis. I think it unlikely that the patients will have been dismissed from any future action, more likely that there will have been an agreement for 'No further action at this time' and the patients asked to return if there are any adverse developments. Circumcision is a relatively simple procedure and it is not a case of 'now or never'; unlike the launching of a lunar probe it does not require a gap in the clouds and absence of wind in the stratosphere as pre-requisite to a successful procedure. If surgery is delayed by para-phimosis or infection the delay is unlikely to be either lengthy or life threatening.

We are advised by our correspondent that the phimotic patients of Drs Lane and South are condemned to a life of sub-standard sex. Really? Compared to what (or rather, to who's experience)? If the patient and his partner feel rewarded by their sexual activity it is not for me, nor I suggest, for anyone, to say that what they enjoy is sub-standard. There is no need to dilate further on this as our correspondent thoughtfully changes tack and reminds us 'some 80% or more of sex is in the mind and not in the penis'. No mention is made

of when this was recorded, how, by whom and who's penis was the measuring stick. Is this, perhaps opinion unobstructed by research?

I do not believe that the foreskin is a design fault nor do I support the view that it is 'a vestigial organ now degenerate and now of little or no utility but ancestrally well developed'.⁽³⁾ Clearly we can live with or without a foreskin, but I believe that the removal of the foreskin has more to do with tribalism, the mistaken pursuit of hygiene and the misguided idea of prettiness than with the promotion of health.

Anon. (Hopefully!)

1. Ostler J. Further fate of the foreskin. *Arch Dis Childhood* 1968; 43: 200-3.
2. Rickwood AMK, Hemalatha V, Backup G, Sptiz L. Phimosis in boys. *Br J Urology* 1980; 52: 147-50
3. *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. 1960

Too Clean

You may be interested in my visit to the doctor many years ago. I had a shower beforehand and liberally applied cologne and a heavy dusting of talcum powder. Stripping to my briefs the aged Asian medic performed the usual sounding of my chest, blood pressure and heart monitoring tests. He then proceeded to examine my genitals. After palpating my testicles he retracted my foreskin to check the glans and meatus. With much tutting he produced a cotton swab with which he very vigorously 'cleansed' my sulcus and penile ridge. Apparently he thought the sticky white powder (which by then had attached itself to my 'helmet') was the dreaded smegma! After roughly cleaning my sensitive bell-end, Dr Singh advised me of the wisdom of good penile hygiene. So it seems that you can be too clean after all...

K.G. - London

Circumcision Festival

I saw in *Lets Go*, a travel book on Turkey, that there is a circumcision festival to be held on the North Coast (Black Sea) at a resort which is apparently accessible only by sea because of mountains or some such. This year it is in July - in the same publication last year it was the 3rd week in July. I do not know if anyone else is interested, I would much like to go but fear the heat, as it must be getting quite warm at this time of year.

David

ACORN

Issue
N^o 2 2001
Editor
Steve Acorn

Editorial

Finally here is the second issue of the year – yes I know its late! It took a long while to get enough material together and then holidays and other complications delayed things further.

Please see the following notice about the meeting in November. Let us know as soon as possible if you would like to come as we need to confirm the reservations. If you are unsure about what to expect or would like any other information please call us on the phone. I hope to see you there.

Finally, there is little point writing to me complaining about there being too few letters in the newsletter that are pro (or anti as the case might be) circumcision. Instead, write the kind of letter that you would like to read, send it in and there is a very good chance that you will read it in the newsletter shortly afterwards.

Steve Acorn

Acorn Society Meeting

A meeting of the Acorn Society is planned to take place in Leicester from Dinner on the evening of Friday 2nd to Sunday 4th

Contents

	Page
What Exactly Constitutes	
A Good Circumcision?	Michael 2
Browned Off Thoughts	Michael 4
In Love With Circumcision	Christopher 5
Indecent?	E.T. 6
Alternative To Revision	C.B. 7
Down Under	R. 8
More Of The	
Penis Puppeteers	Henry 9
Further Advantages Of	
The Muslim Style	Anthony 10
Can't Say No	A. 11
Ideas To Ponder Over	M.W. 12
A Contribution	D. 14
A Snip In Time Saves Lives	15
Snippets From	
Around The World	Henry 16
The Acorn Complex	Alan 16

© 2001 The Acorn Society & Contributors

Correspondence

Please send all correspondence to:-

THE ACORN SOCIETY
P.O. BOX 296
IPSWICH
IP2 8SH

Letters for forwarding should be marked with the recipient's identifier in pencil. They should be stamped 1st class and enclosed in an envelope addressed as above.

E-Mail may be sent to: acornsoc@aol.com

November 2001. Those who have attended earlier meetings will know that we plan to meet informally over dinner on Friday evening and that Saturday morning is 'free time'. On Saturday we plan to meet at 2.00 p.m. and will need a very short Business Meeting.

Cost.

The cost of Dinner, Bed and Breakfast is £44 per person per night. Accommodation is in shared twin bed rooms, I have taken an option on two single rooms for which the charge is £62 per person per night.

Booking: By 30th September.

By Post to Acorn Society P.O. Box 296, Ipswich, IP2 8SH

By e-mail: AcornSociety@hotmail.com

By telephone 07788 126706 (This number is available evening and weekends only)

Want to talk about it? Call the above telephone number as requested.

Please remember that we cancelled the Bournemouth meeting. Had everyone who eventually asked to book accommodation done so before the closing date there would have been no need to cancel the meeting. What happens to those who try to book directly with the Hotel? – We'll draw a veil over those – heavily!

What Exactly Constitutes A Good Circumcision?

All to do with aesthetics one would at first imagine. For most persons viewing circumcision as a simple cut and snip procedure without serious thought as to why it is being done at all, will likely seek the aesthetic approach to what exactly constitutes a good circumcision.

The answer entirely lies in the *motivation* for performing it. To many religious people today who practice this procedure as a religious rite, for them circumcision is meant to be a sign for all to see, to show others that they have a relationship with their God because of it. The Jews in particular realised that it became essential to prevent circumcised males from endeavouring a method to effectively become uncircumcised again, because their God warned that such individuals would be 'cut off' from His promises to them. As such, there came a time in history when the rabbi's insisted on the entire removal of all the foreskin, inner and outer parts, with a totally bared glans essential for all to see, whether on a child or adult.

If anyone today in our society decided, without this Biblical backing, to remove a new born baby's clothes, strap him to a circum-straining board, and without anaesthesia, spend some 10 or 20 minutes cutting away at his penis with a scalpel, he would be called paedophilic, sent to jail for life and would likely end up being tortured to death in jail. No-one dare call the God

who ordained circumcision, paedophilic, and in any case how could mankind bring God to bear for such actions?

If the motive for circumcision is sacrificial then a good circumcision undoubtedly will be one where the maximum cutting of flesh occurs. If the circumcision is but a sign or symbol that the person has undergone a 'token' influence on his sexuality, as opposed to a real one, then just a minimum snip, a super-incision perhaps is a good circumcision. For many Christians today, they see physical circumcision as un-necessary because their circumcision is completely spiritual where all licentious thoughts, sexual indulgences, etc: are 'cut away' from their deepest origins in their heart. This is supposedly achieved by their God. This is a pity in one sense because there is much sexual diversity that I am sure is healthy and acceptable to a God, including being utterly obsessed by the subject – know anyone like this? Eroticism is one reason why parents perform this surgery. Doesn't he (it) look nicer with the end of his little willy uncovered? Looking at the end poking out so, helps me not think about changing his nappies.

For all of us who were circumcised without our consent, I believe we should revel and *live* for exactly those reasons. I was circ'd in the 1940's because masturbation was thought to be so serious an activity that blindness resulted. Masturbation should become my oyster. Circ'd for social reasons to look like others? – then enjoy and revel in looking at one's contemporaries circ'd willies. Circ'd for religious reasons so that it will be a sign to others of other faiths? – then make sure you do just that – show the World your willy, in whatever way is acceptable, and if you land up in court over it, quote the judge the bit in the Bible which tells you that your circ is meant to be a visible sign for all to see.

To many people who have never experienced the emotional and psychological knife on their sex, they really can only see the 'tip of the iceberg' of circumcision. A good circumcision to them is no circumcision at all, because the knife can only mean one thing to them in all their life's experiences. Having said that the form of circumcision varies from superincision where the prepuce is cut on its top surface, nothing is removed and the skin hangs down with glans visibly permanently uncovered (a good start if you want to consider circumcision without losing anything). Some African tribes practice this form, particularly the Nuba.

The Australian aboriginals in particular are the worlds most subincised people, with a very visible groove cut away from often the entire undersurface of the penis from tip of glans all the way to the scrotum, until the urethra is opened. They do this to simulate the female vulva (which they consider something which must surely be true), sacred as life emanates from it, and also to simulate, in the effective bloodletting, menstruation. They necessarily urinate in the squatting position, and their feminine side is thus promoted. A good circumcision for them apparently, lies in the promotion of this otherwise forbidden sexual cross-over.

Michael – Oban

Browned Off Thoughts

I was reading your article, in the Issue No: 1/2000 *Acorn*, by Anthony, entitled 'Browned Off' wherein he offers an explanation for the wide brownish scar on certain American penii, that he concludes can only have been given a Gomco-clamp type of operation to achieve this effective circumcision appearance, many years after the circumcision had been done.

I understood that the Gomco clamp was used, even up to very recent times by more than 50% of medical personnel performing circumcisions in the USA – the Hollister Plastibell technique, slightly less. If this wide brown scar is a feature of this method of ablating the prepuce in entirety, then why do the majority of American surgically modified penii not have this feature, since it is not common? Obviously only a circumciser familiar with this routine for dispatching as many new born foreskins in as little time as possible, can effectively do justice to answering the reason 'why this wide vivid scar?'.

I would like to suggest an explanation: From video's I have seen of the Gomco clamp procedure for circumcision, the skin of the penis is pulled upwards away from the abdomen whilst the clamp tightens this same skin to the bell covering the glans. It appears to me that the clamp is at first slightly tightened so that sufficient tension keeps the outer penile skin against the bell whilst at the same time allowing more skin to be pulled through in case all skin circumferentially has not been pulled through by the same amount or similar tension. If the clamp is just that little bit too tight to allow the skin to go through, it will effectively be compressed as it pulls through a space of insufficient width. During this pulling action through a constricted space, a certain small width of penile skin (and not the inner prepuce skin which is at that time protected by its outer penile skin) will experience a crushing if only lightly, and this will undoubtedly lead to discolouration of the skin involved. The effective width of this scar will be represented by the extent that the skin has been pulled tightly through the clamp.

One must surely appreciate that the circumciser, or medical nurse, has to control the amount of skin being pulled through the clamp device, make sure the tension on the penile skin is approximately the same all around the penis circumference, ensure that too much skin has not been pulled through (or too little) whilst at the same time tightening the clamp to crush the desired amount of foreskin to be removed, and the amount desired exactly by whom? This is really an impossible task to do well.

I don't believe circumcision can ever be done really well, like a face lift, or mole removal. One cannot surely predict how the baby penis will either look or feel many years later after the operation. In circumcision there are far too many unknown or unpredictable factors to enable a perfect operation.

I believe many readers of *Acorn* would love to know exactly how they became dissociated from part of their sexuality and at such a tender age. This can be readily gleaned from the scar type and appearance. Many *Acorn* readers I know will join me in my opinion that there is something special about the American style Gomco procedure for circling with its associated very unique rounded and often tightish scar. In general however, the Gomco does not produce a wide brownish scar, but I have read in the past that the Gomco circumcision line has a more visible nature than the almost equivalent looking Plastibell procedure.

Anyone out there with more explanations of circ appearances and how they got that way?

Michael - Oban

In Love With Circumcision

I just love the circumcised state and would like to see all men and boys circumcised. I first saw a circumcised cock when I was about 8 years old. On the way home from school we crossed some open fields where a group of us sat and talked. One day Dave, a boy who later became a very close friend, pulled his cock out to show that he was different from the other 3 or 4 boys with us. I remember being fascinated by the smooth head, of which he seemed so proud. Years later as 13 year olds we used to wank off together and by then he was really big and his circumcised cock looked fabulous. Although he seemed bigger than me he was often telling me how big I was and especially how thick my shaft was. The only thing he did not like was the fact that I was uncircumcised. He told me that every Saturday afternoon he wanked off with an older boy who was also circumcised and really huge. I have always regretted not getting together with the two of them and I think that the only thing stopping me was my uncircumcised condition.

Though only 8 of the 30 boys in my school class were circumcised I somehow had 3 of those boys in my close circle of 4 friends. I can still remember exactly the boys who were circumcised and even what their cocks looked like although I cannot remember more than a few of the others. Even at home I seemed to be in the company of the few circumcised boys in the neighbourhood and can remember wanking off with 4 of them but only with 2 uncircumcised boys.

Wanking with the circumcised boys was fantastic and I especially remember Trevor who was a year younger than me who liked to see which of the two of us could shoot our loads the quicker. Years later I heard from another boy that Trevor used to suck him off swallowing all his huge load of cum. I just regret that he never did that for me but of course at the time I was uncircumcised and the thought of sucking an uncircumcised penis must surely put anyone off.

How much more is relevant? Dave (not the same one as above) with whom I used to wank off instead of doing games at school had one of the biggest cocks I have seen even at age 14 and was in my view perfectly circumcised. Or Tony who I met at University who really did have the biggest cock I have seen and flaunted his circumcision which was superb and without even a visible trace of a scar which is how I like to see them, but I suppose that only happens if you are done at birth. I always had the feeling that like me he was bisexual but he used to go on so much about 'queers' that I did not dare to show any interest in his magnificent cock.

Or should I describe the fun I had in the local disused quarry with Peter, a neighbour who had quite a small but well circumcised cock who liked to strip naked so that we could better enjoy mutual masturbation. All these boys and many others convinced me that one day I too would be happily circumcised.

Christopher – Cardiff

Indecent?

An event took place last spring which was almost a throwback to the bad old days when London's Finest sought out 'filth' wherever they could find it and administered the law of censorship with ruthless vigour. Now although it is certainly not within our remit to campaign against censorship, nevertheless when occasions of heavy handed and totally disproportionate action are directed in a way which brings our subject into prominence, however marginally, I feel it is time to call attention to it.

What upset the guardians of decency, alerted by a few puritanical members of the public (at the instigation of a nasty Sunday red-top), was a photographic art display by Atlanta-born divorcée Tierney Gearon, who exhibited a number of photographs of her young son and daughter naked at the Saatchi Gallery in London. Tierney, in what to my biased mind seems a spirit of joyous and triumphant rejection of the still widespread American practice of infant circumcision, celebrated her son's intact state whilst expressing her feelings in the exuberant attitude of the boy who was peeing in the direction of Tierney's chosen audience (the American public) in an act of in-your-face defiance.

It is a sad fact that any depiction of children in the nude is now considered akin to child molestation, no matter how innocently portrayed and although Tierney's pictures, while clearly innocent, might be considered to be in poor taste (how will the two kids react to the furore in years to come?) the police's draconian action in trying to ban them provoked a furious public response causing them to withdraw their objection. They should contemplate the fact that their immoderate response brought these 'offensive' images on to the pages of national newspapers whereas only habitués of the Saatchi would have seen them otherwise.

I've no doubt that some will query my interpretation of Tierney's reason for publishing the pictures but as an opponent of RIC I like to think I may be right.

E.T.

Alternative To Revision

I have read with some interest the letters on revisions. In almost all the letters the effect of having very tight skin on the penis shaft when flaccid is that the skin around the base of the penis and around the testicles is stretched up when the penis is erect. I note that one or two correspondents have advised that because of this 'borrowing of skin' they get an amount of discomfort or pain. Not the best advertisement for the procedure but if a guy wants this tight look then no doubt he is prepared to put up with the discomfort to obtain his desired appearance.

From my reading of the letters it is apparent to me that the reason for most revisions is that the guy wants his helmet to be very prominent and not in any way obscured by foreskin/shaftskin when flaccid.

In my own case during an erection my shaft skin is very tight as my foreskin was totally removed when I was circumcised. I need to pull up quite a lot of skin from around the base of the penis to get any skin to stretch up to the rim or just over the rim of the helmet during an erection. When completely flaccid the length of my penis is around three inches and the skin on the shaft is bunched and a small piece sometimes just covers the rim of the helmet. If I pull the skin forward when flaccid I can cover about half or maybe a little more of the helmet but once released however the skin springs back and leaves the helmet exposed.

The length of my penis in a semi-flaccid state (that is stretched out and still soft and not erect) is about four inches and the skin on the shaft is stretched out exposing the half-inch or so of remaining inner foreskin, the circumcision scar and the helmet is very prominent. Now if I could retain this length permanently, so that my penis will not shrink back further, I think I will have achieved, more or less, what others achieve with a revision. I think most guys would like to have a reasonable penis length when flaccid and one frequently reads in various magazines etc that many guys are disappointed at the extent of penis shrinkage experienced when the penis is flaccid.

I remember some years ago reading that it was possible to have the muscle at the base of the penis, which controls the retraction of the penis when not erect, partially severed and this would stop the penis shrinking back and maintain the length. The only drawback to this procedure, so I understand, is that the angle of an erection might not be as steep as before and the penis might become slightly less firm and little more wobbly, as the same muscle

also has some influence/control of the erection function. This apart have any members any knowledge of this procedure and the cost? I suppose like any cosmetic surgery it will cost an arm and a leg for what I would assume would be a 30 minute or so procedure.

As an aside I am amazed at the prices some clinics charge for a circumcision under local anesthetic; when I was circumcised the cost was under £200 now some clinics charge over £1,000. I know everyone wants to make a profit but even when one takes out the surgeon's fee and the overhead of the clinic the profit margin must be very high.

C.B. - Cornwall

Down Under

In Issue 1/2001 (excellent as always), KG refers to a conversation he had with a New Zealander who thought that 'general' circumcision ended there around 1980. As an enthusiast of circumcision, it seems KG's illusions were shattered - Aussies and New Zealanders were not necessarily cut!

I have bad news for him - his Kiwi confidante may well be right.

It is the case that, as a general rule, life in NZ emulates much more closely that in the UK than does that in Australia (which is more likely to follow the US). I have no experience of NZ men, but I have very close experience of a straight Australian man of 25 who works with me. We have the most amazingly detailed discussions (out of work!!) and I ascertained at an early stage that he was uncut. He went on to volunteer that his four older brothers (born between 1970 and 1975 - Catholic family!) were all cut. He (born in 1976) was not cut and nor is his younger brother. He has never understood why his parents decided that, as from him their sons would not be cut but is afraid to ask his mum.

The chronology is rather like that predicted by the Kiwi confidante. I have a hunch (which may well be wrong) that perhaps Dr Spock's baby care book was amended around that time and no longer recommended routine circumcision. Does anyone have copies and could check? That said, most American boys continue to be cut even today, and I believe one of the reasons even more are not cut is that some of the US medical insurers do not consider it medically necessary - insurers always have an eye to saving a quick buck!

My Australian man has quite a lot of foreskin, though not covering his peehole. He nevertheless pulls the skin right back to pee and (he tells me) he prefers it pulled back when he wanks. For all that, he said there was no way he would voluntarily be cut - though this *may* be because of the fear of pain rather than aesthetics etc.

The only other relevant experience I had was a very remote one by internet, with an Australian living in London and who was born about 1970. He said his father was cut, but he was not. Unlike my workmate (and even at a safe distance over the net) he would not elaborate.

Does any of this help?

R.

More Of The Penis Puppeteers

The description of the Penis Puppeteers by J.F. in Issue 4/2000 of *Acorn* did not mention that the two Australians David 'Friendly' Friend and Simon Morley subsequently went on to appear at the Whitehall Theatre in London at the end of last year.

Not wishing to miss the opportunity to see two chaps performing so called dick tricks, I hastened down to the 'Smoke' between Christmas and New Year. I was not to be disappointed.

To put the audience, who seemed to be made up largely of women and homosexual American Tourists, in to the mood for the main event a highly amusing comedienne came to act as warm up. For an hour her mixture of gags and songs, including a spoof version of the 1970s pop song 'Nobody Does it Better' (theme tune of the James Bond film *The Spy Who Loved Me*) with references to lesbian masturbation entertained us.

Following an intermission the two Australians appeared on stage and I knew that what I was about to watch was definitely not suitable for my two young sons – at least not yet! Sitting in the fourth row from the stage and with a screen behind them which magnified everything in close up. I could not help feel awed by the sight of their well endowed appendages which they brazenly strutted for the next hour after removing their skimpy cloaks. Quite how they managed to contort their cocks and balls in to all manner of shapes without hurting themselves went unanswered. In addition I was intrigued that for two chaps who were clearly either circumcised or possessed very short foreskins pulling and stretching shaft skin into party pieces such as 'The Eiffel Tower' was no problem.

My personal highlights were David 'Friendly' Friend holding his dick stretched out and using it like a wind up tool, and Simon Morley's suitably politically incorrect display of his dick next to a picture of the Duke of Edinburgh followed by President Bush. I always wondered what dickheads looked like. There was even a brave young lady from the audience who volunteered to be a prop in one of Simon Morley's stunts. He asked her to stand between his splayed legs while he did a handstand. It is a pity I forgot the gag.

All in all it was a good night out. In retrospect I think that it would make an excellent *Acorn* event, except for those easily shocked or hoping to see erections. The mind boggles to think what our two Australians would do with their members standing to attention. By the way, did any other *Acorn* members see their show? If so, did you enjoy it? And did you buy their accompanying book (last seen on sale at Foyles in Charing Cross Road) with plenty of pictures of tricks to copy.

Henry – Cambs.

Further Advantages Of The Muslim Style

PT – Sussex waxes lyrical on his ‘Muslim cut’. Not deprived of the large area of inner foreskin and thousands of sensitive nerve endings lost by recipients of radical medical circumcision like me (where the membrane is tightly trimmed before suturing cut edges) much of the spectrum of potential pleasure is retained. Whilst my scar line is close to the glans, PT has his mid-way down the shaft, a half penis length of erogenous tissue, lucky man!

For the Muslim style of circumcision, offers a distinct advantage. Fast-breaking is determined by the degree of penile insertion. If the penis reaches the circumcision ring or scar, the fast is broken. Glans insertion and no ejaculation is no misdemeanour, provided the scar remains outside, incredibly enough! For sexual intercourse to take place, the circumcised parts, both male and female, have to make contact. Being able to insert almost half the erect penis is an interesting aspect of ‘Eastern Promise’.

Also Tony’s oriental observations, the Japanese male, should his prepuce slip forward, would quickly retract it in order not to offend against decency. At the bath or during a medical examination, he would never present himself other than decapped. Kawakamuri – Japanese for ‘skin covered’ is a mark of bad taste. The reverse of the natural state is obtained by retaining the retracted prepuce with a string, so eventually it cannot be extended over the glans. Incidentally Japanese art never represents the penis other than denuded.

Musing at the loss of erogenous tissue, I did a parody on the old music hall song *Grandfather’s Clock*, which ‘stopped dead, never to go again when the old man died’.

My Grandfather’s cock was hard as a rock
And my granny approved of the size
It was plump as a plum and mostly feeling numb
Well, because all his foreskin had gone;
It was shed on the morn of the day that he was born
Losing natural cover and pride –
“It was clipped back, never to grow again”
The old man cried.

Ninety years without covering,
Roundhead roundhead
No drawback discovering
Roundhead roundhead
It stayed clipped back, never to grow again
When the old man died.

Anthony

Can't Say No

I usually find something of interest in every issue, but I found two articles of particular interest, issue 3 'A Well Cut Cock' by J.S. of Guernsey, and in issue 4, 'Reply to a Well Cut Cock' by P.T. of Sussex.

Both gentlemen had been fortunate enough to find a surgeon to perform a tight cosmetic circumcision. Stretching the shaft skin very tight when flaccid and pulling the scrotum skin around the base of the shaft forward when erect. The latter gentleman was estimated for a normal circumcision then an extra half inch was cut off to get things really tight.

Is this not dangerous? Is there not a risk of the stitches tearing and the wound bursting open even if he had a minor erection during the recovery period? I would imagine that they would have to be very heavily sedated for a spell. Even after the stitches were removed and the wound healed the scar line would be a weak point and tear open if they indulged in any violent rough action.

After a year or two they will realise that it has been all worthwhile. They will have the much coveted appearance of a well cut cock. Outrageously overexposed and oversexed examples of male perfection. Not my words but stolen from the following article taken from a nudist mag many years ago (possibly in the late twenties or early thirties) also relate to tight circumcisions and I feel it appropriate to publish it as a second follow up to the first. There should be no breach of copyright it is so old and the views expressed possibly outdated.

"If you are circumcised with the head of your penis permanently exposed, how can you make sure that your message reaches on the right people when you strip off on a nudist beach? Even without an erection the sight of a circumcised penis with the head permanently exposed, particularly if it is complimented by a heavy growth of pubic hair, can not fail to indicate maturity and a keen interest in sex.

"A larger percentage of male naturists than any other section of the community seek the help of a plastic surgeon to perform excessively tight cosmetic circumcision.

“Many mature and sexually active nudists have lived to regret it. No matter how much revulsion they may feel towards some undesirable bedmate, they no longer have any control over the signal their body language is radiating.

“Against their will, their body is saying loud and clear; I find you very attractive. My sexual desires are aroused. I am ready — more than willing and at the slightest drop of a pin, I am yours.

“In other words like the words in the Dorris Day song, ‘I can’t say no’. Without actually putting it in to words my penis has been cut and mutilated so that it will never again look flaccid and disinterested in sex.

“The male penis in its natural uncircumcised state is the most sexually expressive part of our bodies, an even better indicator than our face. We can control our facial expression to hide our real feelings but it is far more difficult when totally naked to control our penis.

“Before puberty – a young uncircumcised male will have no pubic hair, his scrotum will be small and tight and he will only expose the head of his penis when urinating. Even after puberty he can only expose the head when has an erection and the head swells enough to hold the foreskin back.

“The head should be visible only when he has an erection and almost reached the point of no return and is bursting for sexual relief. No facial expression or words could give the observer such a strong message.

“In the past male nudists almost without exception have been circumcised and the females have had their breasts enlarged and their nipples altered to stand permanently erect as though the sight of a sexy male penis is turning her on.

“Photographers love this: In body language, messages of sexual desire are being transmitted and received both ways.

“But fashions have changed. Some of the most outrageously oversexed examples of sheer male perfection have not had their male offspring circumcised. Fewer and fewer are having adult circumcisions, and the emphasis now is electrolysis to remove all trace of pubic hair.”

A. – Scotland

Ideas To Ponder Over

In the book, *The Jewish Religion – A Companion* by Louis Jacobs, Oxford University Press 1995, p82, is written,

“The operation (circumcision) is so difficult and so disagreeable, that no-one would undergo it unless he sincerely wished to belong to the people of faith.” Also p83,

“In the early days of the Reform Movement some of the Reformers advocated the abolition of circumcision, protesting that the rite was too particularistic, and too cruel to be retained.”

Circumcision is little else than cruelty to many persons who have undergone the operation of circumcision who have no faith whatever in a God who ordained this rite. It is a blessing to others who believe their entire existence and mapped out life-plan is a result of their circumcisions.

To persons carrying out circumcision, cruelty and disagreeableness are surely not part of their vocabulary. Not all circumcisers and medical personnel performing circumcision believe in God either.

Why therefore are not more persons, particularly atheists, not vocal in an endeavour to eradicate this 'barbaric' medical procedure? Why also do the far majority of men who have undergone medical (as opposed to religious) circumcision at or near birth not scream out intensely concerning it, particularly those who are atheists?

The answer lies in the deep feelings of exquisite pleasure that can and often enter the mind when one just contemplates circumcision, whether one is religious or not.

An atheist not believing in any god, does not by implication mean that there is no God obviously. Also a God is not just 'at work' so to speak only with those who believe in Him. In fact, He is likely just as interested, perhaps even more so, in His creation who do not believe in Him.

It is likely that inexplicable feeling of beauty or just feelings of acceptance concerning one's circumcision status have been 'programmed' in the minds of those who have undergone this otherwise barbaric and unnecessary surgical manipulation and mutilation of our most intimate sexuality.

I strongly believe this to be true, because I have severe burns which somehow do not bother me (only others). I believe this is because I see within my own character something much much stronger and thus inexplicably appealing, because of them. As a male, appearance does not have the same implications as that for women, which also may explain partly why female circumcision is not as an acceptable medical procedure in the World as is that for the male.

Another important fact to the above lies very much in our sub-conscious state, which often can contradict our conscious feelings concerning the emotional pain of having one's most intimate sexuality put under the surgeon's knife for all to either see or publicly know about. The appeal of our sub-conscious state concerning circumcision may well be associated with what every human likes to strive for, which is to be different to the masses in some context or other.

Almost all of us yearn to be rich, and for what reason other than to show off to others that we do not need to be subjected to a society's social control any longer. Men and animals are none too different, primarily because of our animalistic sexual urges to impregnate every available female.

Circumcision changes all that in that a temperance of a circumcised male's sexuality almost certainly occurs with circumcision. Even if the physical senses are not significantly affected by circumcision in young males, the circumcised male knows, senses he is different, to both other men and particularly animals, and thus if only psychologically, he gains control of his sexual urges because circumcision means something extremely important to him, sub-consciously.

Circumcision cuts deep in the minds of those who have undergone this otherwise mutilative genital surgery. If one could analyze the mind, it would likely consist of forces opposed and forces content with the surgery. The forces 'opposed' can be tabulated readily – they exist in abundance in medical literature and especially on the internet. Mutilation is but one of them.

The forces 'content' are not easy to tabulate, but in my own experience, when my sexuality is 'awakened' (as opposed to having to awaken it myself), and it is the correct time for enjoying one's sexuality, sexual pleasure is often directly derived from just contemplating or thinking about circumcision. This must be evident to all readers of *Acorn* magazine. Why do we long to see the next issue, even if we despise circumcision? Maybe we just love to enjoy that which is unenjoyable?

M.W. – Scotland

A Contribution

Congratulations on doing a difficult job Steve, in trying to balance pro and anti circ members views and prejudices. We have now had five issues of the magazine produced by you as editor and I must say that they have been both stimulating and generally refreshing.

There have been a few blots such as I.O. – Herts who bemoans the fact that we have a 'Declining membership' while you, the editor, is saying that the membership is slightly up at just over 180.

Of course R.B.W. also trotting out his fantasy of 'A haemorrhaging membership' despite you telling it like it is of a slightly rising membership. His tired litany of 'comments' bemoaning a lifetime of anguish and distress at being circumcised was first aired in 8/98 and we have now read five times of his woes, the latest in 3/2000. I hope he soon gets over his neurotic obsession of being, in his mind, mutilated. Personally I find some of his remarks objectionable and even insulting to the pro circ members. Such polemic we can do well without. Perhaps he would do better to stick with his Nocirc

fanatical friends or, having stated his opinions, leave it at that. Constant reiteration is not needed.

In contrast there is C.R. with his *Childhood Wish Fulfilled* (3/2000) and Peter (1/2001) telling of his Experience, and many others. Men who do not denigrate others but tell of their own feelings.

I find Cavalier Reasoning difficult to follow as his feelings appear to be ambivalent. He says that he suffers with balanitis and his doctor advised him to have it done and stop messing about. He also says that he prefers the look of a tight cut and that the appearance of his cock with the foreskin fully forward tapering to a point looks infantile and pathetic. One can only echo his doctor's comment to stop messing about and have it circumcised then it won't look infantile and pathetic.

K.G. says that his illusions have been shattered with regard to circumcision in New Zealand. I would suggest that the uncut N.Z. man he encountered in the sauna is expressing his own wish to be in the majority although strangely he says that most antipodean men remain in favour of a tightly cut penis. I would like to revive K.G.'s faith in antipodean circumcision. I cannot trot out figures but I can say that the majority of men and boys I know and have seen are circumcised. I am a member of a sports club and see men and boys in the showers and changing room and believe me circumcised cocks well outnumber uncuts. There appears to be a need by some men to extend their own circumcised state or lack of it onto as many others as possible. The imagination is a wonderful thing though often unreliable. For instance some uncut/cut men feel more secure if they consider most other men are like themselves. In that way figures become exaggerated, or even meaningless.

Thank you Steve for your efforts which are appreciated by most of us and I would urge members to put their thoughts on paper to help fill the columns of the magazine. It is great to know that others are interested in the same things and are prepared to share with the rest of the membership.

D. - N.Z.

A Snip In Time Saves Lives

From The Pink Paper, 23/3/01

John Cairns' ignorant attack on circumcision (Letters, 16 March) does not deserve Letter of the Week status. There are now over 40 studies showing that the absence of a foreskin provides a partial (and I emphasise partial) protection against HIV in heterosexual men. As this protection seems to amount to at least a 50 per cent reduction in transmission it represents millions of lives saved.

The effect is not due to 'religious influences'. These, and other confounding factors, have all been investigated and eliminated. It is also simplistic to

compare AIDS-ridden and circumcised America with healthy, uncut, and culturally very different Japan. The AIDS epidemic in America is years ahead of that in Japan but it is still mostly caught through passive anal sex or needle sharing. Nobody suggests that circumcision will make any difference then! When it is heterosexually transmitted it is disproportionately so in blacks and Hispanics – precisely the groups where circumcision is least common. Cairns' dismissal of an experiment on one foreskin ignores the work done on live monkeys (not reported on *Horizon*) that found that they easily contracted the related SIV through Langerhans cells in their foreskins. With so much evidence against him Mr Cairns' position seems like that of the die-hards who will not accept that HIV causes AIDS. Perhaps we can look forward to his next letter telling us that the earth is flat.

Snippets From Around The World

From the *Encyclopedia of Unusual Sex Practises* (page 62) there is a reference to circumbustion which the Nandi, an African tribe, carried out. The boys were apparently circumcised with a glowing iron that burned off their foreskins as another held it outstretched. Ouch!!

In the same book there is a reference to acuculophiles who are women only sexually aroused by circumcised men. Anybody know such a woman?

From the travel book *Madagascar* (Hilary Bradt, 1999) Page 21, boys are described as being cut at the age of two and a baby who dies before this may not be buried in the family tomb.

In some rural areas circumcision may still be performed with a piece of sharpened bamboo. The foreskin is not always discarded. In the region of Antambahoka it may be eaten by the grandparents and in the region of Antandroy it could be shot from the barrel of a gun!!

From the lonely planet guide *Bali & Lombok* page 359, circumcision is described as an elaborate celebration on the island of Lombok. The boys, aged six to eleven, are carried through the village streets on painted wooden horses or lions accompanied by drums and cymbals. The cut is performed without an anaesthetic as each boy must be prepared to suffer pain for Allah. As soon as it is over, they must enact a ritual known as the 'makka' – a kind of obeisance involving a drawn kris dagger which is held unsheathed.

Henry – Cambs.

The Acorn Complex

Some men find circumcised cocks attractive. For John, or anyone else, to describe cut men as 'mutilated' could give them a complex!

Alan Giles