

Introduction: Gender Equity in Abrahamic Circumcision: Why or Why Not?

Ingvild Bergom Lunde¹ & Matthew Thomas Johnson²

This is an Author's Original Manuscript (AOM) of an article published by Bristol University Press in *Global Discourse*, available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16369920470269>

Key words: Female genital cutting; Dawoodi Bohra; male circumcision;

This issue emerges on the back of more than 40 years after the initiation of zero-tolerance global campaigns to end all forms of female genital cutting (FGC). The practice of cutting female genitalia without medical necessity is commonly referred to as 'female genital cutting', 'female genital mutilation' and/or 'female circumcision'. Sometimes the term 'girl circumcision' is used in order to make a distinction between childhood and adulthood genital cutting on females. The practice is commonly categorized into four types by the World Health Organisation: type I – cutting of the outer clitoris; type II – the partial or total removal of the outer clitoris and the labia minora, with or without excision of the labia majora; type III/infibulation – narrowing the vaginal opening through the creation of a covering seal, with or without removal of the outer clitoris, and; type IV – all other harmful procedures to the female genitalia for non-medical reasons. A body of research from a range of fields shows that, in contemporary hegemonic public discourse, the acceptable way of talking about, interpreting, and comprehending the practice is through a framework of condemnation (Hauge 2012; Hodzic 2017; Lunde 2020; Shell-Duncan et al 2016).

However, in 2018 and 2019 the Dawoodi Bohra Women's Association for Religious Freedom in India released official statements insisting they practice a form of female circumcision that is less invasive than male circumcision in order that girls be treated equally to circumcised boys. The statements further made it clear that the Bohra do not practice 'female genital mutilation' – in fact, they condemn the practice (2018; 2019). These statements highlight two central limitations in the global work to end FGC. First, there has been little to no differentiation between different forms of FGC. Indeed, it is the most invasive form – and likely, the least common globally – that has received most attention in public discourse and among researchers and policy makers. Second, there are central unresolved questions regarding the global North's acceptance of medically unnecessary circumcision of boys, of which there is great variety in the practice, ranging from removing parts of or the entire foreskin of the penis to a cutting in the urinary tube from the scrotum to the glans.

Taking Richard Shweder's (2021) article 'The prosecution of Dawoodi Bohra women: some reasonable doubts' as a target piece for discussion, the aim of this issue is to better understand these limitations. In the article, Shweder proposes that some forms of FGC be legalized, arguing that the form of FGC practiced among Dawoodi Bohra Muslims is less invasive than typical circumcision of boys and that, among the Bohra, FGC is a religiously meaningful ritual. This proposal implies that girls should have the same rights to cultural and/or religious identity as circumcised boys. It is a controversial proposal insofar as it directly challenges the central tenet of global campaigns to end

¹ University of Oslo, Norway, i.b.lunde@medisin.uio.no

² Lancaster University, UK, m.johnson@lancs.ac.uk

FGC, such as target 5.3 in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal: that girls can only be empowered by protecting them from being subjected to a fear-inducing and painful experience.

This issue examines both directions within the equivalence argument: the plausibility of legalization of FGC, but also the possibility that boys require protection from forms of male genital cutting. This second possibility – of proposing an age limit or ban on boy circumcision – is also controversial, particularly at a time in which there is growing concern about anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. This may, in part, explain worldwide reluctance by otherwise interventionist policy makers to act upon the similarities of boy and girl circumcision.

Nevertheless, increased concern on children's rights, anti-circumcision activism and emerging interest within the media in similarities between girl and boys circumcision mean that the articles in this issue feed into a dynamic set of debates within societies. Indeed, where previous generations may have cut without question or rejected any discussion of cutting at all, parents may increasingly need to interrogate the questions of whether, when, how, and on what grounds, they circumcise their children.

By accommodating a wide-range of perspectives on the implications of divergent accounts of harm, this issue does not seek to promote any one particular position. Indeed, the authorship is deliberately diverse in terms of disciplinary, professional and cultural background. However, as with the *Boston Review* series of debates regarding Yael Tamir's (1996) position on FGC, Shweder's article serves as a reference point for a series of critical responses that examine the implications and applications of the notion of cutting in girls and boys being equivalent. In the first article, Bettina Shell-Duncan (2022) argues that, in order to understand the particular constraining conditions within particular contexts, it is necessary to add broader structural and global factors to concern for legal, social and modern vs traditional understandings of agency and choice of parents. Next, Juliet Rogers (2022) shows how the High Court of Australia's failure to consider equivalence disregards women's agency towards God and community in its subscription to the view that the body of a woman becomes injured, a remnant, when she is circumcised as opposed to the male body which becomes part of the nation through circumcision. Brian Earp (2022) shows then how he and Shweder agree on the presence of double standards, but depart in their normative conclusions, with Earp rejecting all medically unnecessary medical cutting of children. Ellen Gruenbaum and Samira Amin Ahmed (2022) then claim that Shweder's defence of the practices of the Dawoodi Bohra is not helpful in Sudan, arguing that female and male genital cutting are best approached as two separate issues, with efforts to eradicate FGC, predominantly type III, already well established and acceptance of male entrenched in public discourse. Next, sharing experiences and reflections on participation in the Islamic bioethical discussion in the 2017-19 Fiqh council in North America, Aasim I. Padela (2022) calls for the inclusion of social scientists, public policy experts, and other relevant scholars in Islamic bioethical deliberations in addition to clinicians and jurists. Then, Brid Hehir (2021) argues that the UK legal context discriminates against women from specific ethnic backgrounds in its criminalization of FGC and permission of forms of labiaplasty. Next, Allan J. Jacobs (2022) shows how understanding of the anatomy of female and male bodies can contribute to debates about circumcision, arguing that the differences in female and male anatomy make female circumcision dangerous in infancy and male circumcision safest in infancy. Carlos Londono Sulkin (2022) then interprets Shweder's imaginative framework as semiotic webs that are not only tools to understand others outside of us, but also means of making sense of ourselves, arguing that semiotically constituted experiences of genitalia are central to how human beings articulate and experience images of the self. Then, Seth Rozin (2022) analyses the anticipated and unanticipated pushback he received in response to his play 'Human Rites', which sought to challenge audiences' assumptions about FGC. Next, Michael Rosman

(2022) usefully explains and analyses debate between Congress and a District Court over the applicability of Section 116 of the US criminal code to the Dawoodi Bohra case. The final reply comes from Fuambai Ahmadu & Tatu Kamau (2022) who analyse the paradox of the treatment of FGC in the Kenyan law, in which legislation appears to privilege gender confirming surgery in a cultural context with less fluid gender norms. In his postscript, Shaye Cohen (2022) writes how his book *Why aren't Jewish Women Circumcised?* (Cohen 2005) is not about the circumcision of women, but rather the non-circumcision of Jewish women, and what makes Jewish women Jewish. The issue ends with a reply by Shweder to the respondents.

References

Ahmadu, F. and Kamau, T. (2022) 'Dr. Tatu Kamau vs. The Attorney General and Others: Problems and Prospects in Kenya's 2021 High Court Ruling to Uphold the Prohibition of FGM Act of 2011', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16388161357195>

Cohen, S. J. D. (2005) *Why Aren't Jewish Women Circumcised?*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cohen, S. J. D. (2022) 'Parity between men and women? Reflections on the circumcision of men and the circumcision of women', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16359777893946>

Dawoodi Bohra Women for Religious Freedom (2019) *Khafz: Circumcision or FGM? Press release*. https://www.dbwrf.org/press_details/125

Dawoodi Bohra Women for Religious Freedom (2018) *Official Statement about the impleadment application filed by DBWRF*. https://dbwrf.org/blog_details/15

Earp, B. (2022) 'Not the goose or gander, but the gosling: the ethics of medically unnecessary genital cutting in Western liberal democracies turns not on sex or harm-levels but consent', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16347905414226>

Gruenbaum, E. and Ahmed, S. A. (2022) 'Thoughtful Comparisons: How do genital cutting traditions change in Sudan?', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16349703862780>

Hauge, M-I. (2012) 'Er det på grunn av omskjæringa du ikke skal gymme?' Læreres tilnærminger og jenters håndtering av omskjæring som tema i skolen' ['Is it because of your circumcision that you are not attending Physical Education?' Teachers' approaches and girls' handling of female circumcision as a topic in school]. *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift* 96(4): 305-316.

Hehir, B. (2022) 'Why we should be concerned about UK FGM laws and associated monitoring and reporting systems: a reply to 'The prosecution of Dawoodi Bohra women' Shweder'', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16343302385556>

Hodzic, S. (2017) *The Twilight of Cutting: African Activism and Life after NGOs*, Oakland: University of California Press.

Jacobs, A. J. (2022) 'Males and females have different anatomy: is this relevant to circumcision?: a reply to The prosecution of Dawoodi Bohra women by Richard Shweder', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16281926170803>

Lunde, I. B. (2020) *A qualitative study on female genital cutting among Kurdish-Norwegians*, PhD thesis, Oslo: University of Oslo.

Padela, A. I. (2022) 'Complexities of Biomedicine, Theology, and Politics in Islamic Bioethical Deliberation over Female Genital X', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16334660756430>

Rogers, J. (2022) 'Remnants of Mutilation: Understanding the High Court deliberation in Australia on the significance of the clitoris, God and Rick Shweder', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16349692612474>

Rosman, M. (2022) 'Federalism and female circumcision in the US: a reply to The prosecution of Dawoodi Bohra women by Richard Shweder', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16264509095737>

Rozin, S. (2022) 'A dramatic interpretation of the fragilities of the FGM narrative: a reply to The prosecution of Dawoodi Bohra women by Richard Shweder', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16261939486586>

Shweder, R. A. (2021) 'The prosecution of Dawoodi Bohra women: Some reasonable doubts'. *Global Discourse*, online ahead of print. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16141809582432>

Shweder, R. A. (2022) 'Permitting Gender Equality in Abrahamic Circumcision: The Central Argument: In Retrospect and Reply', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16394338241091>

Shell-Duncan, B., Naik, R. and Feldman-Jacobs, C. (2016) 'A State-of-Art-Synthesis of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting: What Do We Know Now? October 2016,' *Evidence to End FGM/C: Research to Help Women Thrive*. New York: Population Council.

Shell-Duncan, B. (2022) 'Social and Structural Factors Influencing Women's Agency regarding Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting. An Intersectional Analysis: a reply to 'The persecution of Dawoodi Bohra women''. *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16345524513807>

Sulkin, C. L. (2022) 'On dropping one's trousers and reclaiming relativism: a reply to The prosecution of Dawoodi Bohra women by Richard Shweder', *Global Discourse*, 12(1): <https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16255844555932>

Tamir, Y. (1996) 'Hands off Clitoridectomy', *Boston Review*, 21(3/4): 21-22.

