

## Does science support infant circumcision? Brian D. Earp

According to Brian Morris in a series of recent papers, "Science supports infant circumcision" and in fact the foreskin is such a powerful and imminent threat to male health that it must be severed from a child's body before he can form his own opinion. In this paper, I offer a different perspective. "Science," I argue, can neither support nor oppose infant circumcision. Nor can it take *any* normative position, on any subject, all by itself. In the best-case scenario, science could potentially tell us whether intact vs. circumcised men were more/less prone to certain pathological conditions; but the scenario is not best-case. The existing medical data on circumcision, though abundant, are so contested and inconsistent that we are nowhere close to seeing a scientific consensus on this question; and even if we were, we would still have to think through the ethics. "Science"—alone—cannot save us the effort.

This paper was published in *The Skeptic*:

Earp, B. D., & Darby, R. (2015). Does science support infant circumcision? *The Skeptic*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 23-30. Available at [https://www.academia.edu/9872471/Does\\_science\\_support\\_infant\\_circumcision\\_A\\_skeptical\\_reply\\_to\\_Brian\\_Morris](https://www.academia.edu/9872471/Does_science_support_infant_circumcision_A_skeptical_reply_to_Brian_Morris).

**Brian D. Earp** is a Research Fellow at the Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics at the University of Oxford as well as a Consultant Researcher with the Institute for Science and Ethics, also at Oxford. He has served as Editor in Chief of the *Yale Philosophy Review* as well as Guest Editor of the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, the leading journal in the field. Brian holds degrees from Yale and Oxford universities and is currently a Cambridge Trust Scholar and Rausing Award recipient studying the history and philosophy of science and medicine at the University of Cambridge. Cambridge, England, UK.