Non-therapeutic circumcision is a contentious issue on which most readers will drift toward the position that reflects their backgrounds or affirms their cultural affinities. Unfortunately, the efforts of various self-appointed "experts" have done little to clarify the issues, and some are notorious for cherry-picking a vast and inconclusive medical literature in order to advance their prior agenda.

We invite readers to take the time to read the 29 self-citations that Brian Morris provided in the latest e-letter[1], check out the veracity of the claims contained therein, read the studies attacked by the letters to editor and the responses to these, perform their own literature searches, and reach their own independent, fully-informed judgments. Such a review will show that Morris is simply out of line with most other authorities.

For example, Morris and a colleague have recently disclaimed the Hippocratic Oath,[2] thereby rejecting a venerable medical principle.[3] Even the American Academy of Pediatrics is unwilling[4, 5] to support Morris' assertions that circumcision is a "biomedical imperative"[6] that "should be made compulsory"[7]. Finally, apart from a legally questionable[8] German law protecting religious circumcision,[9] Europe has begun to see circumcision as a violation of an infant's human rights[10-11], medical ethics,[12] and even criminal law.[13-14]
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