

Awkward Behaviors that US can name:

And we do, and we do:

“Is she still photoshopping?”

On its own, that statement is best understood as **image-based reputational abuse** combined with **psychological harassment**.

More precisely, it can be categorized as:

Primary classifications

- **Reputational abuse**
→ It undermines credibility by implying dishonesty or manipulation.
- **Psychological abuse**
→ It is designed to humiliate, provoke self-doubt, or destabilize.
- **Harassment**
→ Especially if repeated, targeted, or said in public/social settings.

Secondary dimensions (context-dependent)

- **Gendered harassment**
→ Policing appearance to devalue or discredit a woman.
 - **Social coercion / dog-whistling**
→ Invites others to question, mock, or dismiss without direct accusation.
 - **Post-separation abuse** (if said by a former abuser or their associates)
→ Continues control through narrative and ridicule.
-

Why it is *not* harmless or casual

That kind of comment:

- Attacks **identity**, not behavior
- Suggests **deception** without evidence
- Shifts focus from substance to appearance
- Encourages others to participate in skepticism or mockery

Courts, workplaces, and institutions increasingly recognize this as **non-physical abuse with real impact**, especially when it contributes to social isolation or reputational harm.

A clear, simple way to name it (if asked)

You could accurately say:

- “That’s reputational harassment.”
- “That’s psychological harassment meant to undermine credibility.”
- “It’s appearance-based reputational abuse.”

Or, if you want one sentence:

“Comments like that are a form of reputational and psychological harassment, not casual remarks.”

Abuse is all around us, it’s good to call it out, and well,
~ take the reins Santa.