

< 2005年度の講義 >

1. 自然神学とその再構築
2. 「宗教と科学」関係論の基礎
3. 現代の環境論とキリスト教思想
4. 現代の生命論とキリスト教思想
 - 4 - 1 現代の生命論と神学 - 問題状況 -
 - 4 - 2 創造論の視点から - 人間の創造性とは -
 - 4 - 3 自己決定原則とキリスト教
展望 - 自然神学の可能性 -

12/9

12/16

4 現代の生命論とキリスト教思想

4 - 1 現代の生命論と神学 - 問題状況 -

- (1) 生命倫理の諸問題
- (2) 聖書の生命観 - 現実主義・現世主義 -
- (3) 問題の多次元性とキリスト教思想固有の問い

4 - 2 創造論の視点から - 人間の創造性とは -

Ted Peters, *Science, Theology and Ethics*, Ashgate 2003

New Knowledge gained from genetics research is raising a host of challenging ethical questions, and these ethical questions are prompting theological reflection. The dramatic scale of the biomedical challenges throws us back upon first principles, back to questions about the nature of human nature, about our relationship to ourselves and to our divine source, God. In the popular press the issue is formulated this way: are we playing God? We formulate it this way: how might theological reflection on the frontier of genetic research guide and direct ethical deliberation?

(139)

the need to know, prepare the way for treatment through genetic therapy

The new knowledge will require new thinking about the ethical, legal and social dimensions of life for the human beings whose cells contain the DNA being studied.

(139)

< ポイント >

- (1) 適切な問いを立てることの意義
何が神学的な問いか
- (2) 出発点としては適当でも、充分ではない論点
 1. プライバシー保護

差別なしの情報

2. 自己同一性・魂の危機

3. 「自然」という問題

自然は善か（自然の状態を変更することは悪か）、「である」から「べき」を論じる
遺伝子神話

(3) 議論のポイント

1. 遺伝子差別という問題

2. 尊厳とは

関係概念としての尊厳

子供の尊厳性の危機、製品・商品としての子供

3. 創造論、神の継続的創造行為は、自然における進化のプロセスを通してのみならず、
人間の創造行為を通して働く。被造的な共同創造者としての人間

技術自体が悪ではない

4. 原罪論、自然が直ちに善ではない

5. 神の愛は遺伝的な構造に左右されるものではない

(4) いくつかの帰結

1. クローニング自体が非倫理的ではない

2. 再生医療のもたらす恩恵は多大である

全面的禁止ではなく、一時的な凍結

<テキスト>

Chapter 7. Genetics and Genethics: Are We Playing God with Our Genes ?

7 - 1 : ヒトゲノム計画

the Human Genome Project (HGP), 1987-2001

The scientific goal was to map and sequence the human DNA.

The primary motive is that which drives all basic science, namely the need to know. The second motive is perhaps even more important, namely, to identify the 4000 or so genes that are suspected to be responsible for inherited diseases and prepare the way for treatment through genetic therapy. (139)

7 - 2 : 遺伝子的差別

genetic discrimination

Screening for all genetic diseases may become routine for newborns just as testing for phenylketonuria (PKU) has been since the 1960s. (140)

Insurance works by sharing risk. When risk is uncertain to all, then all can be asked to contribute equally to the insurance pool. Premiums can be equalized. Once the genetic disorders

of individuals become known, however, this could justify higher premiums for those demonstrating greater risk.

despite its promises for a better life, the HGP could inadvertently create a whole new class of poor people.

7 - 3 : プライバシー保護の観点

This 'privacy defense' argument presumes that, if information can be controlled, then the rights of the individual for employment, insurance and mental care can be protected. There are some grounds for thinking this approach will succeed.

Nevertheless, I believe the privacy defence can at best be a mere stopgap effort. In the long run, it will fail. Insurance carriers will press for legislation more fair to them, and eventually protection of privacy may slip. In the long run, what we want is information without discrimination. The only way to obtain this is to restructure the employment-insurance-health care relationship. (141)

7 - 4 : 遺伝子情報は特許の対象か

It is clear that religious ethicists oppose genetic discrimination. In 1989, the Church and Society commission of the World Council of Churches (142)

In sum, cDNAs may prove patentable on the grounds that they are the production of a humanly devised process of gaining intellectual knowledge. But, at the present moment this appears inappropriate, because the only value of cDNAs is that they tell us in the original DNA. As long as the Douglas principle holds, that processes already occurring in nature are exempt, the human genome itself will not become patentable. (145)

7 - 5 : クリーニング自体は非倫理的ではない、遺伝子神話

It is my own considered judgement that, in principle, no distinctively theological affirmations would make cloning humans unethical. Though not unethical, it might be unwise. I support the attempt to effect a temporary ban against human cloning until good reasons can be brought forth and considered. I do not favor an absolute ban that eliminates all future consideration.

This is an unfounded fear. It is based on the gene myth (which we will discuss later) according to which who we are is determined by our genetic code, that our DNA is our destiny.

Yet, neither science nor common sense support this assumption. Scientifically, the genes alone do not determine our identity. (147)

cloning would be at most only a partial threat.

The experience of identical twins is informative.

It would be society's moral obligation to treat cloned persons as individuals as well. I hold theologically that God loves each of us regardless of our genetic make-up, and that we should do likewise. In secular language, this means that each of us should be treated with dignity.

the gene myth, a widespread cultural thought form that says, 'it's all in the genes'.

The big question here is this: does genetic determinism threaten human free will ? (148)

genotype undetermines phenotype.

A genotype may be a necessary, but only a sufficient, condition for the phenotype (149)

The scientific fact does not itself determine the direction of the ethical interpretation of that fact. (150)

7 - 6 : 自然的であることは善か、原罪論の意義

let us ask more generally: does our biological predisposition toward a specific behavior in itself make that behavior moral or immoral ? If it is natural, is it automatically good ? Not necessarily, according to the concept of original sin. To my observation, religious groups and their theologians have not yet placed this issue on their agenda.

With nature winning over nurture in the gene myth, we will be tempted to ground our morality in nature. (151)

Augustine was led to this type of explanation because of a fundamental commitment to the unity of the human race. This is a double unity, a unity of sin and a unity of salvation.

Augustine was not primarily concerned with the specific propensities each of us has for lust or envy or whatever. That was secondary. Primary was this sense that all of us in the human race are in the same boat, the same sinful boat that is sailing away from consciousness of God and love for one another. Jesus Christ is an individual human being, to be sure; yet, he is much more. Christ is the prototypical human being, the eternal logos and the image of the divine --- the true imago dei --- under the conditions of humanity.

If we try to apply the Augustinian notion of original sin to the present discussion, it would seem that the gay gene would find its place in the larger description of a human condition that includes all of us. (152)

Whether a given individual has the gay gene or the homophobic gene, the ethical mandate applies to both.

One of the major weakness in the Augustinian solution is that we in the modern world cannot split nature and history in quite the same way he did.

In sum, the Christian understanding of original sin as bequeathed from Augustine has less to do with biological determinants of our behavior and more to do with the unity all we humans share with one another in both Adam and Christ. Nevertheless, this theological tradition will be skeptical of arguments that seek moral approval on the basis of genetic determinism. The gene myth has no automatic theological endorsement. To reiterate: the scientific fact does not itself determine the direction of the ethical interpretation of that fact. (153)

7 - 7 : 子供の尊厳の問題

the distinction between somatic therapy and enhancement

In shorts, genetic enhancement risks violating human dignity by opening up the possibility of discrimination.

Religious ethicists agree: somatic therapy should be pursued, but enhancement through germline raises cautions about protecting human dignity. (154)

the WCC does not forbid forever germline therapy or even enhancement: rather, it cautions us to wait and see.

the image of the 'perfect child' to be a clear and present danger

7 - 8 : 創造論との連関から

The concept of creation includes anthropology and the notion that the human race is created in the image. I will argue here that if we understand God's creative activity as giving the world a future, and if we understand the human being as a created co-creator, then ethics begins with envisioning a better future. This suggests we should at minimum keep the door open to improving the human genetic lot. To seek a better future is to 'play human' as God intends us to. (155)

The phrase 'playing God' raises up for us the question of the relationship between the divine creator and the human creature. We can distinguish the Christian and Jewish theism from a naturalism that reveres life from the religious belief in God as creator of all things, life included. Natural life, important as it is, is not ultimate. God is ultimate. Life, as everything else in existence, is finite, temporal and mortal. We must avoid idolatrous expectations of technology, to be sure; 'but to presume that human technological intervention violates God's rule is to worship Mother Nature, not the creator. Natural processes are not sacrosanct'. (157)

Some of our farsighted religious leader have entered into serious conversation with conscientious scientists so that cooperative thinking about our response and responsibility for the future can be anticipated. (157)

God continues to create in and through natural genetic selection and even through human invention in the natural processes.

7 - 9 : 尊厳性の問題

By 'dignity' they mean what philosopher Immanuel Kant meant, namely, that we treat each human being as an end, not merely as a means to some further end. As church leaders respond responsibly to new developments in the HGP, we can confidently forecast one thing: this affirmation of dignity will become decisive for thinking through the ethical implications of genetic engineering. Promoting dignity is a way of drawing an ethical implication from what the theologian can safely say, namely, that God loves each human being regardless of our genetic make-up and therefore, we should love one another according to this model.

Yet, there is more. The theology of co-creation leads Ronald Cole-Turner to a beneficent vision: 'For the church, it is not enough to avoid the risks. Genetic engineering must contribute in a positive way to make the world more just and more ecologically sustainable, and it must contribute to the health and nutrition of all humanity.' (158)

Chapter 8. Cloning Shock: A Theological Reaction.

8 - 1 : クローニングと神学の問い

cloning. ... this as a theological issue. It is more than just science. This science raises

religious questions, and the ambient anxiety raises ethical ire.

Philip Hefner at the Chicago Center for Religion and Science (CCRS) told the press that we should be stewards of this new cloning capability and that we are accountable to God for what we do. (165)

that cloning is potentially good, because ' God could be seen as continuing to create through human activity'.

8 - 2 : クローニングの何が問題か、個人の自己同一性が商品化か、隠れた自然主義

I will argue on scientific and theological grounds that we can safely say that no serious threat to human individuality or identity exists here. I will then proceed to assert that on distinctively theological grounds, no good reason proscribing human cloning can be mustered. However, this does not preclude other grounds for caution. I will caution us to guard against misuse of cloning as a 'for sale' service in human reproduction on the grounds that it risks commodifying children.

to protect the dignity of future children. (166)

When receiving a shock from an electrical outlet, we immediately withdraw our hand to safety. So also, it appears, cloning shock causes us to withdraw immediately into what we hope will be safety: namely, a theologically grounded opposition. We say, 'No to the new procedure.' And we add, 'We say "no" because God says, "no".' 'But, I ask: does God really say 'No' ?

uniqueness of human life, which God has given to each of us and to no one else.

Both the original DNA donor and the clone would have identical genotypes. But, we might ask, does this mean that they would have identical phenotypes ? No, not necessarily. DNA does not always express itself in predictable fashion. the experience of twins (168)

they remain two separate individuals with separate lives to lead.

Each has his or her own soul, his or her own connection to God.

The soul is not a metaphysical appendage to the physical.

The key understanding the soul theologically is not its emergence beyond the physical as psyche or mind. Rather, the key is understanding the soul in terms of our relationship to God. The unique relation of a person to God is not determined by DNA. It is determined by God's active grace, by God's desire to love us as we are.

Neither our individuality nor our soul is threatened by cloning. 'My value or dignity is given by God; it derives from the fact that God loves me.... Soul has to do with our standing before God. (169)

This kind of argument betrays a veiled naturalism, a variant on the alleged 'thou shalt not play God' commandment. It presupposes that what nature bequeaths us prior to human choice has a higher moral status than what happens when we influence nature through technological intervention. Cloners cannot be excused, because they could. The fact that clones are predetermined by human decision is allegedly what makes cloning immoral and warrants legislation to ban the practice. What nature does is legal, and what we do will be moral if we copy nature. The argument commits the 'genetic fallacy': it tries to base an 'ought' on an 'is' --- that is, it argues that, because nature has behaved in a certain way in the past, we ought to

behave the same way in the future. This is a fallacy, because moral judgements are intended to pull us forward a reality better than the one we have inherited.

8 - 3 : 子供の尊厳への脅威 = 商品化の危険

My chief concern ... is the risk cloning might pose to the dignity of children. My concern for cloning is not based on a perceived threat to the individuality or identity of the child. Rather, it is based on the potential that cloning along with other genetic technologies, may play into the hands of economic forces that will tend to commodify newborn children. (171)

its fear of commodification

8 - 4 : 関係概念としての尊厳

1 John 4:19, ... This religious commitment has an Enlightenment or secular companion principle, namely, we should treat each person as an end and not merely as a means for something more valuable. These two together are the heartbeat of what I mean by dignity.

Significant here is that dignity is a relational concept. ... Yet dignity, as we actually experience it, is relational. It is the experience of being treated as worthy, and then incorporating into ourselves the sense of self-worth. ... To treat a person as a person of worth is to love. In complementary fashion, love is a relational force that enhances an individual's sense of self-worth.

(172)

8 - 5 : 賜物あるいは製品？

children as a gift, children as product

Gift here ... by hinting that a gift comes to us from beyond and may even have a mysterious dimension to it.

We can forecast that reproductive clinics would market cloning along with these other services to potential parents. (173)

The new element with cloning and related genetic advance is 'quality control'. The motives for a clone conception are likely to include the desire to replicate a favorite relative or perhaps to borrow DNA from someone known for good health, intelligence or athletic prowess.

Genetic advances in general --- and cloning procedures in particular --- will increase the prospect of 'designer babies'.

8 - 6 : 全面的な禁止ではなく一時的な禁止

Is this risk sufficient to warrant a total ban on human cloning ? Perhaps not. But warning sirens should alert us to potential harm to the dignity of cloned children. Ethical thinking leading to public policy should be the order of the day. Rather than a green light or a permanent red light, I endorse the amber light of a temporary ban until safety and ethical issue can be sorted out.

the new world of expanded choice

Rather, we need to construct ethical visions that take expanded choice into consideration. We need to construct ethical visions of just what it means to treat children with dignity when they are the product --- that is, when they are the gift --- of advanced reproductive technology.

(174)

Chapter 9. The Stem Cell Debate: Ethical Questions.

9 - 1 : 幹細胞問題とは、適切な問いを立てること

I will refer to this chapter as 'the stem cell debate'. The debate has only begun. What is not yet clear is just what needs to be debated. Perhaps nothing. Perhaps everything. (177)

The enormous potential value of Stem Cell Research

I will ask more questions than I am ready to answer, yet I believe that such work invested in trying to formulate the relevant question(die Fragestellung) takes us more than just half way toward a helpful answer. (178)

9 - 2 : 部分と全体

Our body parts have a level of dignity, to be sure, but it is a dignity borrowed from ourselves as whole persons.

9 - 3 : 幹細胞は人格か？ 研究を継続する意義

What is in petri dish ? A person ? No, I do not think so.

The potential for reducing human suffering and improving human health and well-being is enormous. If it cannot be shown conclusively that individual human dignity is violated at the source of stem cells, then it seems to me that the argument from beneficence should be decisive in providing ethical encouragement to proceed with such research. (187)

Chapter 10. Designer Children: The Market World of Reproductive Choice.

10 - 1 : 自由市場的優生学、社会的欲望の問題、プライバシーあるいは差別

I call the newer version free market eugenics. (191)

Out of fear that genetic information could be used discriminate, the Pentagon restricts the use of DNA for the identification of human remains on the battlefield.

In late 1995, the Genetic Privacy Act (193)

This is a good start, but in my judgement it is not enough.

Rather than privacy, it seems to me that we want genetic information without discrimination. (194)

10 - 2 : 遺伝子差別と選択的中絶、保険、選択に直面して

a connection between genetic discrimination and selective abortion

Genetic criteria will play a major role.

In addition to pressure from the privately funded insurance industry,

Prenatal testing to identify disease-related genes will likely become routine,

Parents wanting what they believe to be a perfectly health child may abort repeatedly at each hint of a genetic disorder. (195)

we are unprepared for the kind of decisions large numbers of prospective parents will be

confronting.

10 - 3 : 選択を導く中間的原理

what we need now are middle axioms to guide the choices that will inevitably confront the next generation of parents-to-be.

First, selecting out defective or undesirable genes is better done prior to conception than after.

Second, the choice of selective abortion should be the last resort.

Third, the motive of compassion that seeks to minimize suffering on the part of children coming into the world should hold relative sway when choosing for or against selective abortion.

Fourth, we should distinguish between eugenic purposes and compassion purposes when engaged in genetic selection.

Fifth, we should distinguish between preventing suffering and enhancing genetic potential.

(198)

10 - 4 : デザイナーベイビーと商品化の危険、機能強化の禁止に十分な理由となるか 「神は遺伝子の構造にかかわらず私たちに愛してくださった、わたしたちも同じようにすべきである」

In the future, when genetic selection and perhaps even genetic engineering make possible designer babies that may have higher than average intelligence, good looks or athletic prowess, we will move closer to the perfect child syndrome. ... That there is risk of commodification does not in itself provide sufficient warrant for prohibiting enhancement, but it will call forth attention to what I believe to be a sound biblically defensible principle: God loves us regardless of our genetic Makeup, and we should do likewise.

(199)