

Foreskin or Against?

Andrew Sullivan **says** of a **Reuters piece** about a study claiming to show that circumcised penises are just as sensitive as uncircumcised ones:

My own anti-circumcision view, however, is not based on the idea that mutilated men have less pleasure. It's based on the simple notion that individuals' bodies should not be permanently altered without their consent, unless the medical evidence for such a procedure is overwhelming.

We hope that he would not actually support the idea that innocent people's bodies should be altered without their consent, whatever the medical evidence! Perhaps what Mr Sullivan intended to say was that it would be unreasonable to assume consent on the part of the baby about to be circumcised, unless, say, the baby has a particular medical condition and no less invasive treatment is possible.

But to get back to the study: the questions it asked were necessarily mechanistic – and rightly so, because otherwise it would have been another case of scientism – so it does not really address the issue of 'sensitivity' in the sense anyone is interested in. Furthermore, the study's sample size is so small that it isn't difficult to find people who have engaged sexually with more men than were in the study. When we asked a few of our more experienced friends whether their intimate knowledge of both circumcised and uncircumcised men led them to concur with the study, the answer was no.

Europeans are often shocked to learn that circumcision is so common in the US. It is not common (apart from for religious reasons) in the UK, Europe and Australia. Parents in America are beginning to question circumcision, but many lack basic information. They are unaware, for example, that there is a difference in functionality between the circumcised and the uncircumcised penis. At the risk of getting a little too graphic here, the lack of moveable skin affects masturbation, etc. If interested, see the five photographs at the bottom of **this page**. Note the two lines drawn on the skin, showing how it moves. Whilst the functionality argument is obviously trumped by the human rights

argument above, some might want to take it into account when

making the decision.

Sat, 05/03/2003 - 01:34 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Amos

I'm no experts on men's dicks, but I can tell you that circumcision is very common, in fact nearly the norm, here in australia.

by a reader on Sun, 05/04/2003 - 15:10 | [reply](#)

Another Aussie

I'll second that observation. In my (limited to looking only) experience, it is the uncircumcized male that is the minority in Australia.

by a reader on Mon, 05/05/2003 - 03:04 | [reply](#)

A Circumcised Aussie

I was born in Sydney Australia in 1962. The first time I saw an uncircumcised dick was when I was 8 years old - a kid from England flashed his 'elephant trunk' in the classroom. All the other Aussie boys I knew were circumcised. I grew up thinking that in Australia you were born circumcised & that kids from Europe just had a stranger looking dick. You only have to visit any of the beautiful clothing-optional beaches in Sydney Harbour (I like Cobblers Beach the most)to see that the majority of Aussie men are circumcised.

by a reader on Fri, 10/17/2003 - 16:26 | [reply](#)

we're all cut here in Australia

My experience was the same. I didn't know there was such a thing as circumcision until I was over 10 when I asked what the word circumcision meant. I pretty much only ever saw circumcised dicks when I was growing up. And that's great - they're the best looking dicks around.

by a reader on Tue, 10/12/2004 - 13:29 | [reply](#)

i dont care!!

Well my's is uncircumcison,it's very overwhelming not being circumcised i was born puerto rico and lived in NY and now in FL,a long time a go, i told my friend that i was uncircumsed this when i just found out about it. so year have pass and one day my friend tell another one of my friend about my you know what.start calling me 'elephant trunk' and then pull back man which they got form the wal-mart comm on tv. this make me feel like \$hit every time they talk about it so about 10-20 people now know that i'm not circumcsed.and i'm 16 year old now!

by a reader on Thu, 10/28/2004 - 10:14 | [reply](#)

Circ'd at 15

Ever since I was little I wondered why my "thing" looked different. So I finally found out. When I found out it could be done easily I got it done in about an hour and I'm feeling free and fine with the results.

by a reader on Thu, 10/28/2004 - 22:14 | [reply](#)

Everybody is right!

The number of circumcised males counted over all age groups in Australia is currently well into the 65-75% range, but only about 15% of baby boys are now cut at birth. The very high (~90%) rates for infant circumcision were from about 1935 to 1970. The circumcision rate for each age group has been falling steadily since about 1975 when Australian doctors decided to refuse to offer it as a procedure at birth (although some would still provide it on parental request). So everyone is right! (But surgery without consent when there's no real reason is always wrong!)

by "an Aussie doctor" on Mon, 12/06/2004 - 15:08 | [reply](#)

Cut Aussie

I agree. Most men in Australia have been cut. I went to an all boys school and the majority there were cut. It is so much cleaner and looks better

by a reader on Sun, 12/12/2004 - 22:22 | [reply](#)

Yes again

I'm another Aussie guy who was born here in 1973. Pretty much every kid I knew while I was growing up was circumcised - I think a few of the Greek kids at school were intact but everyone else had been done. Australia seems to be thought of as a non circumcising country but even now, many of my peers are having their kids done with no problem at all.

Incidentally, an ex of mine told me about an ex of hers (still with me?) who was circumcised at age 19 and swore it was the best thing he'd done. My ex said he certainly seemed to be no less sensitive for it.

by a reader in oz on Wed, 01/12/2005 - 11:40 | [reply](#)

Saudi-islamo-Treachery

Saudi Arabia originally offered \$10 million for tsunami relief; then, after international criticism, upped its pledge to \$30 million. This sum is dwarfed by the \$150 million per year the Saudis have given to the families of suicide bombers. Meanwhile, according to government websites, they spend billions funding 1,500 mosques,

more than 200 colleges, and some 2,000 schools for Muslim children in Europe, North and South America, Australia, and Asia. Their aim is not to alleviate human suffering, or even Muslim suffering, but only to promote their version of Islam.

The tsunami tragedy shows once more that Islamist extremism does not seek freedom, democracy, or the alleviation of poverty. Its explicit goal is to advance enmity between Wahhabis and all others, and to create reactionary regimes ruled by a perversion of Islamic law. The extremists would remove a Muslim leader such as Mohammed Yunus, and perhaps execute him for the "crime" of cremating Hindu bodies and placing crosses on the graves of Christian victims. Islamist extremism--an incubator not only of terrorism but also of universal hatred--is the enemy of all other beliefs.

by pilgrim on Wed, 01/12/2005 - 18:06 | [reply](#)

how did you get circumsied

how did you get circumsied

by sam on Sat, 02/19/2005 - 22:26 | [reply](#)

you dipshit pilgrim

pilgrim you fanny. what the fuck has that got to do with circumcision. and are you so unaware that America is currently spending BILLIONS on keeping the corrupt saudia royals in power. if it wasnt for the THOUSANDS of American soldiers the Saudia royals would of been lynched and their dead bodies dragged around the streets.

forget the Tsunami. did you know the same amount of people die EVERY WEEK because of starvation and disease in Africa????? and before you bitch about Saudias whose wealth is being robbed by America (over a trillion dollars is in America out of saudia money) do you realise that America spends every year OVER 400 billion dollars on its milatry. it would cost America 40 billion to completely stop world hunger and all those people from dying.

and before you start all that "aid" bullshit no country offered out of their "hearts" straight away did they. The donations were so late and constantly chaning in Europe and America becasue of pure political reasons.

by a reader on Wed, 05/04/2005 - 21:59 | [reply](#)

I was born in Holland, but my

I was born in Holland, but my dad is american. When i was born, the doctors didnt accept to do circumcision on me. They thought it was abnormal and dangerous.... So my dad brought me into the U.S. so they could have the operation done. Im so glad they did it

to me, In my opinion, A Cut dick looks SOOOO much better than an

uncut one. I personally think about all the uncut dutch guys and its gross. These are things i love about The USA, Canada and Australia. The majority of their males are cut.

by Kehivi on Tue, 02/14/2006 - 21:03 | [reply](#)

Cutting Edge Australia

All this just shows how easy it is to get your foreskin in a twist.

It is plain to me that Australia is a circumcised country but is no longer a circumcising country.

Personally I don't give rat's arse about "your" foreskin or lack of it, but I sure wish adults would let kids keep theirs long enough to make up their own minds about it.

Whose dick is it anyway?

by a reader on Thu, 03/30/2006 - 09:35 | [reply](#)

Well, I'm an aussie born in 1

Well, I'm an aussie born in 1976 and I'd say 80% of my year were uncut. The cut kids were the one's who are in the minority.

by 76er on Fri, 04/21/2006 - 19:01 | [reply](#)

I'm glad my mum made the right decision

I found the last post a little weird. I was born in 1975 and i reckon about 90% of my year were cut all through school.

I was cut at birth, and I believe my mum made the right choice. It is way better and looks much nicer. fioreskins are just so damn UGLY!!! If I ever have a son, he will be cut within the 1st 6 months of birth.

by a reader on Mon, 08/21/2006 - 06:42 | [reply](#)

add on to the last post

I was born in australia too.

by a reader on Mon, 08/21/2006 - 06:43 | [reply](#)

"abnormal and dangerous"

"the doctors didnt accept to do circumcision on me. They thought it was abnormal and dangerous..."

Then one really has to question their medical qualifications. Dangerous?!!! What utter drivle.

by **Yoni** on Sun, 09/10/2006 - 16:07 | [reply](#)

A short story

Today, the circumcision rate is very low in Australia. I am 20 and have just completed my final year of university in Brisbane. All through high-school/secondary school i thought i was in the minority with an uncircum sized penis. After school when my friends and I were more open about each other, I realised that only one of my friends was circum sized, and he felt quite embaressed. Every time he looked like hooking up with a girl he would tell her first that he was cut (not that she would really care). Since school i have had sex with about 15 women and not one of them has made any comment on my foreskin. My current girlfriend has never even been with a guy who has a cut penis, and asked me one day what exactly a circumcision involved. After explaining the pros and cons of the operation, she couldn't believe the mutilation. The POINT is, circumcisioin is not really performed on younger generation Australians. Most guys now under 25 have not been circumcised.

by Student on Thu, 12/14/2006 - 01:37 | [reply](#)

circumcision

I was born in Australia in 1950 of Australian parents.I am not circumcised but almost all other males born then, about 95%, were.

I think that circumcision is a good idea and had our 3 sons done.

by a reader on Sun, 10/21/2007 - 18:48 | [reply](#)

[home](#) | [archives](#) | [polls](#) | [search](#)

Copyright © 2009 Setting The World To Rights