



The Ethics Cup

2022 Regionals Case Set

Case Authors: Enrico Galvagni, Eline Gerritsen, Jakob Hinze, Lara Jost, Josh Kelsall, Nick Kuespert, Colin McLean, Ben Sachs, Joe Slater, Luca Stroppa

Please do not reproduce without giving credit as appropriate.

Centre for Ethics,
Philosophy and
Public Affairs



University of
St Andrews

FOUNDED
1413

1. Plastic Straw Ban

In England, 4.7 billion plastic straws, 1.8 billion cotton buds with plastic stems and 316 million plastic stirrers are used every year.¹ The plastic waste that results from these single-use items damages the environment. To address this, legislation was implemented in October 2020 that bans businesses in England from supplying single-use plastic straws, cotton buds and drink stirrers to customers. This policy has received wide support and a similar ban is being considered in Scotland.² Although these single-use plastics form only a small part of our negative impact on the environment, eliminating them seems a relatively easy way to treat the planet better.

However, disability activists have complained that for many people abandoning plastic straws is not an option. Some people with disabilities rely on straws to drink safely and without assistance. Straws made of alternative materials are often not suitable: metal, glass and bamboo straws can lead to injuries, and paper and pasta straws can disintegrate and form choking hazards. Moreover, reusable straws are more expensive and are hard to clean for persons with certain disabilities.³

The plastic straw ban in England does include an exemption for disabled persons: although catering establishments cannot make straws visible or freely available, they can supply them when requested by customers.⁴ Activists argue that such an opt-in system still harms disabled persons: they are now required to disclose their disability to strangers and are dependent on staff members believing they need a straw.⁵ This puts a burden on people to always plan ahead and bring their own straw or risk not being able to drink.⁶

Study Questions

1. Does the benefit to the environment of a plastic straw ban like the one implemented in England outweigh the burden it imposes on disabled persons? Is it appropriate to settle this issue by comparing costs and benefits, or are there inviolable rights at stake here?
2. There are many products that are equally or more damaging to the environment but have not been banned. Given this, can it be justified to restrict the supply of plastic straws despite their important function for some disabled persons?
3. The opt-in system requires those who need straws to ask for them. An alternative is an opt-out system, where straws are available but those who do not need them are expected not to take them. Considering the impact on disabled people, should the opt-in system for plastic straws be replaced by an opt-out system?

¹ <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/ban-plastic-straws-cotton-buds-england-start-date-why-alternatives-b718892.html>

² <https://www.gov.scot/news/tackling-single-use-plastic/>

³ <https://cdmns.org/blog/disability-dialogue/grasping-at-straws-the-ableism-of-the-straw-ban/>

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/straws-cotton-buds-and-drink-stirrers-ban-rules-for-businesses-in-england>

⁵ <https://creakyjoints.org/advocacy/plastic-straw-bans-bad-for-people-with-disabilities/>

⁶ <https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2018/07/11/627773979/why-people-with-disabilities-want-bans-on-plastic-straws-to-be-more-flexible?t=1614858337236>

2. Democracy by Lot

East Belgium is the smallest legislative unit in Europe. The region only has 77,000 inhabitants but nevertheless has its own parliament (comparable to other regional parliaments in larger states, for example the ones in Scotland and Wales). Who becomes an MP is determined by recurring elections.

In September 2019, the East Belgian Parliament handed over some of its powers to “the first permanent citizens’ assembly in the world.”⁷ The key feature of this citizen assembly is that its 24 members are chosen at random from the population. Anyone above the age of 16 might be selected to serve an 18-month term on the assembly (all residents are eligible; being Belgian is not a prerequisite).

The citizen assembly runs parallel to the Parliament, and can put any topic it deems important onto the political agenda. If a proposal wins the support of 80% of the assembly’s members, parliament is obliged to consider it.⁸

Supporters of this reform celebrate it as nothing less than a blueprint for the democracy of the future.⁹ Elections, they argue, produce a “natural aristocracy” that is increasingly detached from the rest of the population. Growing dissatisfaction with existing democratic institutions across Western democracies pays witness to this widening gap. Selecting decision-makers by lot is supposed to ensure that political decisions are truly representative of what the people want. Critics hold that randomly selected citizens lack the expertise to engage in political decision-making and worry that they cannot be held accountable to the public in the way elected representatives can be.¹⁰

Study questions

1. What are the potential benefits of selecting political representatives by lot rather than electing them? What are the potential hazards, and do the benefits outweigh the problems?
2. Every once in a while, there is a debate in the UK on whether the House of Lords should be reformed or abolished. What if the House was replaced by a chamber of randomly selected citizens? Would that enhance the legitimacy of the House?
3. Is it important that representatives are particularly distinguished members of the community? Or is it more important that they are similar to the people who they represent?

⁷ <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/belgiums-experiment-in-a-new-kind-of-democracy>

⁸ You can find a graphical illustration of the process at <https://oidp.net/en/practice.php?id=1237>.

⁹ In fact, it is also the democracy of the past: in ancient Greece, legislators were selected by lot rather than through elections. The philosopher Aristotle famously regarded the selection by lot as democratic and elections as oligarchic. Cf. <https://www.economist.com/europe/2019/10/03/a-belgian-experiment-that-aristotle-would-have-approved-of>

¹⁰ <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/belgiums-experiment-in-a-new-kind-of-democracy>

3. Banning Guns

There is widespread disagreement regarding the expected benefits and costs of banning the private ownership of guns (henceforth, simply ‘banning guns’). While this is a live issue in the U.S., the ethical questions behind this debate are more general, and not specific to the U.S. context. One argument in favour of banning guns contends that doing so is conducive to the best overall consequences (for example, by reducing gun-related homicides, accidental deaths and suicides). However, many gun rights advocates contend that *even if* banning guns is conducive to the best overall consequences, doing so is nonetheless morally wrong.

Briefly stated, their argument runs as follows. Everyone has a right to self-defence, which includes the right to an effective means of defending oneself. And since guns are the only effective means of self-defence (even in a society where guns are banned), everyone has a right to own a gun. So, by banning guns, the state overrides its citizens’ rights to self-defence.¹¹ Yet it is typically impermissible to override a right for the sake of securing a greater good. For example, it seems impermissible to override an innocent person’s right not to be killed, even when doing so is necessary to reduce overall harm (say, by preventing the deaths of two other innocent people).¹²

Many gun rights advocates agree that the right to self-defence is derivative of a more fundamental right to physical security. However, Jeff McMahan argues that since citizens are *on average* safer when guns are banned, banning guns is “respectful of the more fundamental right [to physical security] from which the right of self-defence is derived”.¹³

Study Question

1. Depending on how much violence occurs in a given society, does the right to self-defense support the right to own a gun?
2. Is the right to self-defense sufficiently weighty to prohibit overriding it for the sake of preventing gun-related harms such as death and serious injury?
3. Is McMahan’s argument successful?

¹¹ DeGrazia, D. & Hunt, L. H. (2016) *Debating Gun Control: How Much Regulation Do We Need?* Oxford University Press USA.

¹² Huemer, M. (2003) Is There a Right to Own a Gun? *Social Theory and Practice* 29 (2): 297-324.

¹³ <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/19/why-gun-control-is-not-enough/>

4. Universal Basic Income vs Means-Tested Income

Universal Basic Income (UBI) is seen by many as a solution to poverty, wealth inequality, social justice, and overloaded government bureaucracy.¹⁴ UBI is simple: transfer a fixed amount of money to everyone, every month, to guarantee a basic livelihood. Unlike means-tested income, UBI is unconditional, everyone receives it, no matter their current financial situations.

There are numerous questions surrounding the feasibility of UBI. Opponents argue that it is too expensive, whereas proponents point out that it is affordable because it would cut down the complex bureaucracy of current social benefit systems, saving millions.¹⁵ While feasibility is important, another big debate is whether UBI is actually the best use of public money.

UBI is unconditional. The homeless man on the street, the single mother on a zero-hour contract, will get much needed support to make their lives better, but so would Bill Gates, who, arguably, has little need for that money. Critics of UBI argue that this is unacceptable, and that public money should be means-tested, to ensure that it goes to those who actually need it.¹⁶ Supporters of UBI however, argue that there is intrinsic value to the unconditional benefit of UBI, in the same way that there is universal benefit to other unconditional public services, such as the NHS, public schools, and roads.¹⁷

For your answers to the case study questions, imagine that UBI is affordable. Imagining this, the questions will focus on whether you think that UBI is a fair way to distribute wealth, or whether you think there is a fairer way.

Study Questions

1. Is it fair to give unconditional income to every citizen, no matter their income bracket?
2. Would it be fairer to only offer basic income to those below a certain threshold?
3. If there is value in having unconditional access to healthcare, education, and transport, regardless of wealth, could there also be value in having unconditional access to Basic Income?
4. Do you think wealthier people would be more content with paying for UBI, since they will get some of the money that they pay for back, or more content with paying for means-tested benefits, for which they get no money back? Do you think this matters for whether we should implement UBI or not.

¹⁴ <https://theconversation.com/is-basic-income-a-good-idea-heres-what-the-evidence-from-around-the-world-says-132337>

¹⁵ <https://theconversation.com/why-universal-basic-income-costs-far-less-than-you-think-101134>

¹⁶ P.17: https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/CSJ_UBI_August-2018.pdf

¹⁷ <https://medium.com/@taptiklis/why-a-ubi-that-includes-the-rich-is-good-for-everyone-2cf4265fed34>

5. Citizenship Status at Birth

Laws determining citizenship at birth typically rest on one of two principles: *jus soli* ('right of soil') or *jus sanguinis* ('right of blood'). Under *jus soli*, citizenship is granted if the child is born in a country's territory regardless of the citizenship status of the parents. Under *jus sanguinis*, citizenship is granted if one or both parents have citizenship regardless of the location of the child's birth. While many states operate under one or the other of these principles to the exclusion of the others, others operate under a mixed regime, the most common of which is a modification of *jus soli* under which citizenship is granted to all children born in the territory except those born to persons who are in the country illegally.

Recent decades have seen the emergence of a debate in *jus soli* jurisdictions over so-called 'birth tourism'.¹⁸ These are cases where expecting parents travel to a country where they do not have citizenship to deliver the baby with the sole purpose of having their child gain citizenship in that country before returning home. Unambiguous statistics are hard to come by, but some evidence suggests a rising trend in such cases, primarily in the developed world.^{19,20}

Critics of the practice argue that it frequently leaves hospitals on the hook for large unpaid bills, redirects healthcare resources away from residents, raises national security concerns, and debases the value of citizenship.²¹ Others argue that that the numbers are so low that it isn't a genuine problem, that attempts to curtail that practice will disproportionately harm stateless persons and/or migrants who benefit most from current policies, and that the debate itself is fuelled by racist and sexist assumptions.²²

Study Questions

1. Should birth tourism be accepted as a legitimate way of obtaining citizenship or does it amount to an undesirable legal loophole? Does the answer to this question depend on who the tourists are, e.g., wealthy non-residents versus stateless persons?
2. Should citizenship at birth be determined *jus soli* (restricted or unrestricted), *jus sanguinis*, or in some other way? Does the answer to this question apply to all countries, or might different countries be justified in adopting different regimes? If the latter, what sorts of considerations are relevant for evaluating their choice of regime?

¹⁸ For examples, see: <https://www.cbc.ca/radio/thesundayedition/the-sunday-edition-december-9-2018-1.4928492/birth-tourism-may-become-a-hot-button-issue-in-the-next-federal-election-1.4928501>; <https://www.rnz.co.nz/international/pacific-news/396771/cnmi-seeks-federal-help-to-curb-birth-tourism>; <https://foreignpolicy.com/2010/08/09/anchor-baby-boom/>

¹⁹ <https://globalnews.ca/news/5930406/canada-election-birth-tourism-bc/>. For a critique of these statistics see <https://www.imtj.com/news/scale-canada%E2%80%99s-birth-tourism-exaggerated/>

²⁰ <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/feds-raid-l-maternity-hotel-birth-tourists-n315996>

²¹ <https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/2019/0508/When-does-birthright-citizenship-become-citizenship-for-sale>

²² <https://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/january-2020/birth-tourism-and-the-demonizing-of-pregnant-migrant-women/>

6. Anti-natalism

Everyone you have ever met has been conceived. Usually, people think having children is a good thing. We congratulate parents who have recently had children. They also receive various social benefits. In most countries new mothers – and increasingly, fathers too – are entitled to paid parental leave. And the state typically provides child support to help parents raise their offspring. There are even social stigmas attached to people who choose not to have children. Not everyone *has to* have children, but we do think of ourselves as having a *right* to have children.

However, recently, a dissenting voice has received some attention: Anti-natalism is the view that it is morally wrong to bring children into the world. It is notable that no one is able to consent to being born. Given that being conceived is a precursor to all the suffering one can ever experience, and that everyone who suffers this ordeal (as an anti-natalist may phrase it) will ultimately have to face death, conception might look like the type of act for which you should get permission before inflicting upon someone. South African philosopher David Benatar has been a prominent advocate of these types of arguments, which he advances in his controversial book, *Better Never to Have Been*. Recently, anti-natalism was even covered in popular news outlets, after Raphael Samuel, an Indian businessman, sued his parents for being born.²³

There are less extreme groups which also advocate procreative restrictions. For instance, *BirthStrike* is made up of members who have decided that they will not have children under current circumstances. Typically, they cite the climate crisis as a reason why we shouldn't bring additional children into the world.²⁴ They see the ability to abstain from having children as a way of demanding that certain social and economic changes are made.

Study Questions

1. Given that in all circumstance becoming a parent means condemning one's child to physical and mental pain from time to time, is there anything effective that one can say to justify choosing to become a parent?
2. If your answer to the first question was yes, consider this question: If the circumstances are particularly bad—e.g., if as a potential parent you know your children would have lives that, due to the climate crisis, involved low air quality, overcrowding and increased risks of serious diseases—would it be wrong for you to have children?
3. Can abstaining from procreation be an effective form of protest?

²³ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-india-47154287>

²⁴ <https://www.birthstrikeforfuture.com/>

7. Digital Resurrection Through Computer-Generated Imagery

Representations of people in Computer-Generated Imagery (CGI) animations are now almost indistinguishable from videos of those people. Lately CGI has been used to solve practical problems arising in movie production. For instance, it was used in the production of *Fast & Furious 7* (2015) after one of its stars, Paul Walker (1973-2013), died. In other cases, the digital resurrection of actors through CGI was planned and scripted from the start, as was the case in Peter Cushing's (1913-1994) reappearance in the spin-off *Rogue One: A Star Wars Story* (2016).

On the one hand, the recreation of dead actors' image and bodily movements on screen generated without their consent seems to wrong them. On the other hand, new technologies often represent an important source of creative power, and CGI may be invaluable—as a source of both expressive potential for film makers and aesthetic enjoyment for the public.

Study Questions

1. We publish and read private letters, diaries, and unfinished works from deceased authors who wanted that material to be destroyed. Do we have to say that this is wrong if we say that making CGI animations of the sort discussed above is wrong?
2. Suppose that the director did not get the actor's consent to reproducing their image before they died, but has good reasons to believe that the actor would have liked for their image to be used this way. Can this make it OK for the director to create the reproduction?
3. Should film makers be able to use CGI to achieve important aesthetical results without the actor's consent?

8. Outfit Regulations in Sports

In July 2021, the Norwegian women's beach handball team was fined 150 euros per player by the International Handball Federation for wearing spandex shorts to the European Beach Handball Championship, instead of the required bikini bottoms²⁵.

This event sparked debate about the sexualization of women athletes²⁶, given that men beach handball players have to wear shorts and a vest top to play, while women must wear a sports bra and a bikini bottom²⁷. Martine Welfler, one of the Norwegian players, argued that the case for allowing women to wear shorts is even stronger than the case for requiring men to wear shorts, given the amount of body shaming women players experience. Her teammate Katinka Haltvik expressed a worry that some women would rather not play if forced to wear a bikini bottom²⁸.

On the other hand, the International Handball Federation explained that many teams like to play in bikini bottoms, especially in South America²⁹. Alix Klineman, who plays beach volleyball for the American team, argues that wearing a bikini to play sports on the beach makes sense, as these sports were developed in hot places, where people would play and then go jump in the water³⁰. Thus, the bikini bottoms are a nod to the history and origins of the sport. Finally, the outfit might be part of what makes the sports so popular. For instance, the women's beach volleyball tournament has been broadcast in prime-time U.S broadcast slots during the Olympics and has gathered a lot more attention than the men's tournament³¹. Thus, the athletes who decide to wear shorts might undermine the popularity of the sport.

Study Questions

1. Do athletes have an obligation to the relevant sports federation to take reasonable measures to ensure the continuing popularity of the sport?
2. Does requiring female athletes to dress a certain way become less objectionable if the required dress is based on a tradition that has its roots in women's free choices?
3. Is it morally acceptable for the International Handball Federation to maintain different uniform standards for men and women?

²⁵ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-57967486>

²⁶ This case uses binary gender language (men and women) to present the various arguments. However, it is important to note that not all athletes participating in women's sports identify as women. A similar observation can be made about athletes participating in men's sports.

²⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/music/2021/jul/26/pink-offers-to-pay-fines-for-norwegian-womens-beach-handball-team-sexist>

²⁸ <https://www.thecut.com/2021/07/norwegian-womens-beach-handball-team-fined-for-tiny-shorts.html>

²⁹ <https://www.thecut.com/2021/07/norwegian-womens-beach-handball-team-fined-for-tiny-shorts.html>

³⁰ <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-07-27/explainer-why-olympic-beach-volleyball-players-wear-bikinis>

³¹ <https://www.cbc.ca/sports/olympics/summer/volleyball/beach/olympic-beach-volleyball-why-women-wear-bikinis-1.6119234>

9. Banning short domestic flights

In April 2021, French lawmakers voted to abolish domestic flights where a direct rail alternative under two and a half hours exists. This affects about 12% of domestic flights in France.³² The motivation for the new legislation is the adverse environmental impact of short domestic flights (much of the pollution from aviation comes from take-off and landing). Travelling a kilometre on a domestic flight emits about 70% more carbon dioxide equivalents than a kilometre on a long-haul flight. Travelling the same distance by rail is even more efficient; a domestic flight emits more than six times as much carbon dioxide equivalents as travelling the same distance by train.³³ The legislation is moderate compared to the initial proposal, which aimed at abolishing domestic flights where an alternative train connection in under four hours exists.

Some have called for similar legislation in other countries, including the UK. A law identical to the one in France would, for example, prohibit the popular flight connection between London and Manchester. Proponents of the policy point to the positive impact on the environment. Abolishing short domestic flights is a low-hanging fruit in the fight against climate change; given that rail alternatives exist, the policy does not harm travellers significantly. Opponents of the policy point out that travelling by train is often more expensive than travelling by air, and consequently the law will affect primarily low-income households. Further, one may question relying on bans instead of incentives. Implementing heavy taxation on short domestic flights would also reduce the volume of such flights, thus contributing to an overall decrease in pollution.

Study questions

1. If certain routes are prohibited by law, does the government have a responsibility to ensure that rail alternatives are affordable?
2. If certain routes are prohibited by law, should the government compensate companies currently offering flights on the affected routes?
3. In general, are bans an appropriate measure to fight climate change or should policymakers work with alternatives such as increased taxation instead?
4. Should the UK adopt a similar legislation on domestic flights as France?

³² <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/apr/13/france-ban-short-domestic-flights-britain-air-travel>

³³ <https://ourworldindata.org/travel-carbon-footprint>

10. Youth quotas

Many highly relevant political decisions impact the interest of young and future people, including the education budget and climate change policies. However, young people are severely underrepresented in politics. As of August 2021, members of the UK parliament and the EU parliament average 51 years of age—approximately 10 years more than their citizens' average.³⁴ The situation is even worse in the US, where the Congress averages 57 years, and the US Senate averages 63 years, approximately 20 years more than their citizens' average.³⁵ Globally, 6% of politicians are younger than 35, and fewer than 2% are younger than 30.³⁶ This has often led politicians to overlook or discount the needs of young and future people, and as a result implement policies that are not optimal on the long term. Furthermore, being underrepresented may discourage them from participating in the democratic process, leading to their interests being even more neglected.

In order to avoid this problem, some proposed quotas of young people participating in the government.³⁷ For example, we could require that at least 20% of government seats are filled by people younger than 30. However, some say that it is more democratic to let the country freely elect the parliament of the age it wants, and that it would be discriminatory to give young people privileged access to government roles. Furthermore, some believe that people elected under quotas will be stigmatized and considered less competent than people elected without, which will lead to those people being given less power, thus rendering the quotas ineffective.

Study Questions

1. Are quotas anti-democratic?
2. Can quotas be of symbolic importance? Can they be a symbolic reminder of people whose interests are systematically underappreciated?
3. Should youth quotas in government be implemented?

³⁴ <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/house-of-commons-trends-the-age-of-mps/>, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_ATA\(2020\)646202](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_ATA(2020)646202) . The average age of UK citizens is 40 (see <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/annualmidyearpopulationestimates/mid2019estimates>) and the median age of EU citizens is 42.5 (see <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/europe-population/>)

³⁵ <https://guides.loc.gov/116th-congress-book-list>. The average age of US citizens is 38.5: see <https://worldpopulationreview.com/state-rankings/median-age-by-state>.

³⁶ <https://www.un.org/youthenvoy/political-participation/>

³⁷ This idea was advanced at this conference <https://www.youth.ie/articles/fit-for-purpose-does-traditional-politics-work-for-young-people/>, the summary of which can be read here <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/social-affairs/quotas-for-young-people-in-politics-suggested-to-attract-them-1.4351866> .

11. Male Circumcision

Male circumcision is the “surgical removal of the foreskin...the roll of skin that covers the end of the penis”.³⁸ According to the World Health Organization, neonatal male circumcision is widespread in the United States (with 60-90% of newborn males undergoing the process) and most countries in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf; the WHO also notes that the prevalence of the practice in these countries is due to its being seen by Muslims and Jews as a religious duty.³⁹ However, questions are now being asked as to whether it is right for parents to subject their new-born boys to this procedure for nontherapeutic reasons—i.e. when they have no medical condition for which circumcision would be a treatment.

Some of the controversy is down to a difference in scientific opinion as to the medical benefits and risks of non-therapeutic neonatal male circumcision (NNMC).⁴⁰ As the British Medical Association (BMA) notes, there isn’t even a consensus among medical professionals as to what the foreskin is for.⁴¹

In light of this, the Danish Medical Association has said that NNMC is ethically unacceptable.⁴² Their concern—a concern shared by various commentators⁴³—is that NNMC amounts to the imposition of a health risk on a person who cannot consent to the imposition. One can appeal here to the idea that children have what the philosopher Joel Feinberg called “a right to an open future”, and that therefore each boy himself, once he reaches the age of maturity, should be permitted to decide whether to undergo circumcision.

On the other hand, the BMA notes the significant cultural benefit of “increased acceptance into a family or society that circumcision can confer”, arguing that “[e]xclusion may cause harm by, for example, complicating the individual’s search for identity and sense of belonging”.⁴⁴ More generally, we generally allow parents wide latitude in how they raise their children, including the latitude to indoctrinate them into a religious tradition.

Study Questions

1. Is it ethical for parents to choose for their child to undergo NNMC?
2. Is it ethical for a doctor to offer to carry out NNMC, given the uncertainty about its medical risks and benefits?

³⁸ <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/circumcision-in-boys/>

³⁹ https://www.who.int/hiv/pub/malecircumcision/neonatal_child_MC_UNAIDS.pdf

⁴⁰ The American Academy of Pediatrics, for instance, says the benefits outweigh the risks. But the British Medical Association claims that we lack sufficient evidence to draw a conclusion one way or the other.

⁴¹ <https://www.bma.org.uk/advice/employment/ethics/children-and-young-people/non-therapeutic-male-circumcision-of-children-ethics-toolkit/1-background-information-on-non-therapeutic-male-circumcision#controversial>

⁴² <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/08/world/europe/circumcision-boys-babies.html>

⁴³ See, for instance, <https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/nontherapeutic-circumcision-minors-ethically-problematic-form-iatrogenic-injury/2017-08> and <https://www.doctorsopposingcircumcision.org/for-professionals/medical-ethics/>.

⁴⁴ <https://jme.bmj.com/content/30/3/259>