

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision: Responding to Brian Morris

Max Fish ✉, Arianne Shahvisi, Tatenda Gwaambuka, Godfrey B Tangwa, Daniel Ncayiyana, Brian D Earp

Clinical Infectious Diseases, ciab204, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab204>

Published: 02 March 2021 **Article history** ▼

This is the authors' copy of an in-press paper. It may be cited as follows:

Fish, M., Shahvisi, A., Gwaambuka, T., Tangwa, G., Ncayiyana, D., & Earp, B. D. (2021) Voluntary medical male circumcision: responding to Brian Morris. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, online ahead of print at <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab204>

Dear Editor,

We read with interest the recent article by Morris [1], ostensibly commenting on new research published in this journal showing durable effects of voluntary medical male circumcision (VMMC) for HIV prevention in Rakai, Uganda, but also devoting considerable length to critiquing an unrelated paper of ours that was published in *Developing World Bioethics* [2]. We evaluated VMMC in the context of neocolonialism, arguing that African communities need a greater voice in the campaign. In discussing our paper, Morris makes false or misleading claims, misrepresents our findings, and reveals a superficial understanding of literature. We correct the record.

Several errors concern lead-author Max Fish and her organization, the VMMC Experience Project. The organization's mission is not, as Morris states, "specifically to oppose VMMC," but is rather to provide a platform for those affected by VMMC to reach policymakers. Additional mistakes include Fish's name (erroneously identified as "Maxine"), her organization's name (misprinted four times), and her professional background. The incorrect claim that Fish is a journalist has appeared exclusively on anti-circumcision websites, raising

concerns about Morris' sources. Fish, whom Morris likens to "antivaxxers," is in fact a strong proponent of vaccination and former editor of *Human Vaccines and Immunotherapeutics*. A quote from Peter Aggleton is carelessly misattributed to us.

Morris characterizes us as "white ... westerners ... playing the race card," thereby erasing the African half of our authorship (their substantial contributions notwithstanding [3-5]). This erasure is consistent with the concerns of our paper. Morris does not address our findings, yet suggests that many Africans who accept them will "suffer, and then die." His unsupported charges of "scurrilous smear tactics," "denial of science," and anti-vaccination ideology may constitute libel.

To the longstanding medical debate surrounding VMMC, Morris states: "There is no controversy in the medical scientific [*sic*] community." This is false. In addition to the references collected here [6], the fifth-author of our report, Daniel Ncayiyana, is Emeritus President of the South African Medical Association and was editor of the *South African Medical Journal*, including Editor-in-Chief, for 20 years. Morris seems to define the bounds of the "medical scientific" community as the subset of that community that shares his views. Accordingly, he cites his own review paper, which contains nearly 70 self-authored references [7]. Others have noted Morris' reliance on his own polemical "critiques" (such as the one to which we are responding) to populate biased summaries of the literature [8]. Further isolating himself, Morris proposes early infant circumcision for HIV prevention, omitting that such a program was already implemented, and subsequently suspended due to the high rate of adverse events [2].

Morris highlights African involvement and describes the current WHO Director-General Tedros Ghebreyesus as a "black Ethiopian" to suggest that VMMC policy is not racist (unaware that Ghebreyesus was appointed a decade after the WHO policy in question). As we discussed [2], the presence of African-born elites cannot substitute for the voices of the communities

affected by Western-led policies. Morris’ perfunctory mention of VMMC “acceptability” studies—which we acknowledged and critiqued as inadequate—suggests he did not read our paper carefully.

We thank Morris for highlighting our work despite misrepresenting it. We encourage those interested to read it and form their own opinions.

References:

1. Morris BJ. Voluntary medical male circumcision proves robust for mitigating heterosexual HIV infection. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020, ciaa1542 [epub ahead of print]
2. Fish M, Shahvisi A, Gwaambuka T, et al. A new Tuskegee? Unethical human experimentation and Western neocolonialism in the mass circumcision of African men. *Dev World Bioeth* 2020 [epub ahead of print]
3. Tangwa GB. Bioethics, biotechnology and culture: a voice from the margins. *Dev World Bioeth* 2004; 4, 125–38.
4. Ncayiyana DJ. The illusive promise of circumcision to prevent female-to-male HIV infection: not the way to go for South Africa. *South Afr Med J* 2011, 101(11), 775–777.
5. Gwaambuka T. (2019, December 10). Chopped: Exposing the Colonial and Scientifically Dubious Circumcision of 23 Million African Men. *The African Exponent*.
<https://www.africanexponent.com/post/4749-the-medical-male-circumcision-drive-is-a-disaster-in-the-making>.
6. (n.d.) Further Reading. Retrieved October 27, 2020 from <https://vmmcproject.org/further-reading>
7. Morris BJ, Moreton S, Krieger JN. Critical evaluation of arguments opposing male circumcision: a systematic review. *J Evid Based Med* 2019;1-28.
8. Van Howe, R. S. Expertise or ideology? A response to Morris et al. 2016. *Glob Public Health* 2018, 13(12), 1900-1918.