

自然の諸問題から公共性へ - キリスト教思想の視点から -

S. Ashina

1 自然神学から公共神学へ

1 環境論とキリスト教思想

- 環境・経済・政治 -

1 - 1 : 環境論と聖書解釈 - 創造論から終末論へ -

- ( 1 ) 論争の舞台としての創造論
- ( 2 ) 創造論から終末論へ
- ( 3 ) 環境論にとっての聖書の意義

1 - 2 : 経済的政治的な問いとしての環境論

- ( 1 ) キリスト教思想と環境論との積極的な結びつきとその条件
- ( 2 ) 環境論と政治・経済とのリンク      キリスト教的な公共性論の構築
- ( 3 ) John B. Cobb, Jr.: Christianity, Economics, and Ecology
- ( 4 ) Larry Rasmussen, Global Eco-Justice: The Church's Mission in Urban Society

2 生命論とキリスト教思想

- 生命・経済・政治 -

2 - 1 : 脳死論、そしてクローニング

2 - 2 : 自己決定論と共同体論

2 - 1 : 脳死論、そしてクローニング

( 1 ) 生命倫理の諸問題

- 1 . 現代の問題状況 : 1960 年代・70 年代、生命倫理の発生      問いとしての生命  
科学技術の進歩と、選択の範囲の拡大 ( より自由に )  
生命の発端と終局、そして過程において

人間はいつから人間か ? ( 人間はいつ人間であることをやめるのか ? )

生殖革命、墮胎・幼児遺棄の問題

脳死・臓器移植

人体の改造、「子ども」誕生      人権の主体としての幼児

- 2 . 自由原理      自己決定原則

cf. 環境倫理 : 平等原理

- 3 . 1980 年代後半、あるいは 1990 年代以降の変化

人間の改造、 Are We Playing God with Our Genes ?

日本 : 自由原理の後退

- 4 . 問題 : キリスト教的視点とは、宗教的次元とは、何が宗教的な問いか。

(2) 生の次元論から脳死論の宗教的次元へ

5. 脳死・臓器移植問題の教訓

- ・合意形成の未熟さ、はじめに臓器移植ありき
- ・学際的討論の場としての自然神学の不在

6. ティリッヒの次元論(多次元的統一性としての生)

次元の区別(相互の非還元性)      個別的視点

次元の統一性      総合的視点

- ・脳死の判定基準(竹内基準)      科学的(生物学的医学的) = 可変的・暫定的
- ・法的次元の問題、違法性阻却論の可能性
- ・医療制度の次元の問題      有限な資源の分配に関する自由と平等  
だれがどの程度負担するのか(医療保険制度)  
臓器はどのようにして確保可能か(交通事故)
- ・医者と患者との関係      医者との倫理への信頼性の問題  
インフォームド・コンセント  
倫理と教育と制度との複合的問題

芦名定道 「ティリッヒ 生の次元論と科学の問題」、『ティリッヒ研究』創刊号

2000年 (pp.1-16 <http://www.bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/christ/tillich/tillichstudies1/ashina1.pdf>)

『宗教学のエッセンス - 宗教・呪術・科学 - 』北樹出版 1993年、196 - 214頁

7. 脳死・臓器移植をめぐる宗教的問題

生命の価値を決定するのは誰か

権利は神に、しかし、人間が責任を問われる

キリスト教的原則：生命の最終決定者は神である

人間の恣意的な判断の禁止

存在することの意味(創造の善性)

「にもかかわらず」無意味ではない

他者の死への依存(人間は関係存在である)

8. だれが、生命をめぐる最終的決断を担うのか?

本人? 家族(家長・大人)? 世間? 国家? 神?

9. 類似の問題：自殺と安楽死

これは、個人の権利の事柄か?

自分だけで生きているという意味の「個人」の抽象性

10. 自由の限界：「他者危害の原則」(他人を傷つけない限りでしか、自己決定権は行使できない)だけでは十分ではない。

自由も有限性を免れ得ない。

11. 臓器移植を肯定する精神性と宗教

システム以前(システムの根拠)の問題      隣人愛

原則化できることと、そのつどの状況で反復すべきこと

< 1ヨハネ3 >

16 イエスは、わたしたちのために、命を捨ててくださいました。そのことによって、わたしたちは愛を知りました。だから、わたしたちも兄弟のために命を捨てるべきです。

12. 安楽死法的前提は何か？

自己決定原理の健全な展開を必要とする。

(3) クローニング

13. 島藺進 『いのちの始まりの生命倫理

受精卵・クローン胚の作成・利用は認められるか』春秋社 2006年

総合科学技術会議（首相が主宰）の生命倫理専門委員会(1997-2004)

最終報告書「ヒト胚の取扱いに関する基本的考え方」(2004年7月)

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

1. クローニング自体は非倫理的ではない。人間の尊厳とは何か？
2. 個人の自己同一性を脅かすというよりも、子供の商品化という問題
3. 「自然的」とは何か、自然 = 善か？
4. 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。

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

・ 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)

- ・ 遺伝子の差別 (genetic discrimination)
- ・ プライバシー保護の観点
- ・ クロ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)

・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)

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)

岡本祐一郎 「「自己決定」批判に反対!」、『異議あり! 生命・環境倫理学』  
ナカニシヤ出版 2002年

「まず、「自然だ」としても、「それがいい」ということにはならない。これは通常「自然主義的誤り」と呼ばれるもので、「事実(……である)」から「価値(……がいい)」は出てこない」(129)、「自然」かどうかは、ある意味では、それが社会的に流通しているかどうか依存している」、「クローン人間が自然に反している」というのは、トートロジーにすぎない」(130)

「「デザイナー・ベビー」は必然なのだ。今後、遺伝子診断は「問題児」を回避するためばかりでなく、「優秀児」を選択するためにも行われるようになる。「試験管内で培養された受精卵の中で、どの受精卵が一番望ましいか。」これが問題になる」(135)、「ケガや病気の際は整形してもいいが、美容目的はダメだ」とは言えない」「遺伝子を改造する社会がそこまで来ている。この時、あなたはど

うするのだろうか」(139)

・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

・創造論との連関から、人間の行為を通した創造

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.

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.

・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. .... 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. (158)

Chapter 8. Cloning Shock: A Theological Reaction.

・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. ....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.

・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)

・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)

・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)

Chapter 9. The Stem Cell Debate: Ethical Questions.

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

15 . David H. Smith and Cynthia B. Cohen (ed.), *A Christian Response to the New Genetics. Religious, Ethical, and Social Issues*, Rowman & Littlefield Publisher 2003

7. Bruce Jennings and Elizabeth Heitman, *Genetics and Genetic Technology in Social Context*, pp. 131-146

No science or technology, least of all genetics, exists in a social, cultural, or historical vacuum. Like most human activities, science is a social practice, and the application of genetic knowledge is influenced by historical experience and social values. ... the influences run both ways. (131)

Chapter 4 provides an overview of the terrible history of American, English, and Nazi German social policy intended to "improve" the human race through eugenics. .... "public health genetics" (132)

Individual choices are made with at least some degree of freedom, but "voluntary" is a slippery term, and strongly held social values can be partially coercive of individuals.

How to define health and illness

Genetics may give us more precise ways of describing disease, but science cannot remove the social dimension in defining "normal". (133)

the common desire to be healthy or to have a healthy baby may be redirected toward the goal of being free from genetic flaws or having a child without genetic flaws, a quest for an unattainable perfection.

While few can argue against the importance of eliminating diseases that cause terrible suffering, defining genetic health as the absence of certain genetic abnormalities may further blur the already fading distinction between therapy for disease and enhancement of characteristics that are statistically normal but less than ideal.

notions of "disease", "disability", and "handicap" as originally proposed by the WHO in 1980

a continuum composing biological, psychological, and social/cultural components of the sickness or disability

disease: the biological abnormality of dysfunction within the person's body

impairment: the external manifestation of the disease

disability: the behavioral limitation associated with the impairment

handicap: the socially created difficulties or disadvantages (135)

the term "genetic disease" should be used cautiously, as it suggests a genetic determinism that

is scientifically indefensible.

misinformation and misunderstanding about genetic diagnosis will foster prejudice against individuals with specific genetic mutations: the resulting stigma ... the value-laden diagnostic labels and stereotypical characterizations (137)

The social identity and roles of individuals and groups diagnosed with some genetic anomalies may also be subject to the unfortunate tendency of even educated Americans to interpret illness in moral terms and to find the afflicted "deserving" of their conditions. .... disease is the result of sin, spiritual impurity, or a lack of faith. .... these beliefs recur throughout the history of Judeo-Christian thought...

The line between the moral judgement of disease as punishment for sin and the scientific view of disease as a natural consequence of unhealthy behavior is blurry. (138)

The rapid diffusion and application of genetic tests may be at least partly attributable to the "technological imperative", the perceived need to use a new medical technology simply because exists.

in health care, the temptations at both the individual and the social level are often too great to resist.(140)

while technology expands our apparent choices in some ways, it may limit choice in others. .... it may limit choice directly by forcing us to make decisions that we would not have to face if we did not have the information provided by technology.

we often unconsciously internalize the imperatives and expectations of technology as we live in modern society. The power of the genetic technology to define who you are, what you are, what your life possibilities are , and what limits you should place on yourself is a phenomenon that is obscured by the social ideology of technology as an expander of choice and freedom.(141)

The technology can inspire an idolatrous veneration that displaces more basic commitments to seeing our lives as gifts and other persons as creatures to whom justice is due.

insurance companies

employers (142)

8 Mary R. Anderlik and Jan C. Heller, The Economics and Politics of the New Genetics

9 David A. Ames, The Role of the Church in the New Genetics

16 . イエスの奇跡行為の社会的現実性、奇跡の社会的次元

・何が真に驚くべきことか？

John Dominic Crossan

・ヨハネ 6.1-15 cf. マタイ 14.13-21、マルコ 6.30-44、ルカ 9.10-17

17 . 「自然の神学」は「文化の神学」を前提にする（ティリッヒ）。

公共性の神学としての文化の神学