

第XII卷 第2期 2014年

ISSN 1386-6354

中外醫學哲學

本期主編：范瑞平

文化與生命倫理

導論：生命倫理與文化自覺 范瑞平

主題論文：

王鳳儀倫理療病闡析——
儒家生命倫理之活例 張祥龍

預期壽命與生命之道——
以當代中國與法國哲學家為例 何懷宏

Bioethics and Culture:
Understanding the Contemporary Crisis in Bioethics David Solomon



香港浸會大學
HONG KONG BAPTIST UNIVERSITY



應用倫理學研究中心
CENTRE FOR APPLIED ETHICS

Global Scholarly Publications

Vol.12 No.2 (2014)

文化與生命倫理
Culture and Bioethics

本期編輯：范瑞平
Issue Editor: Fan Ruiping

范瑞平 Fan Ruiping	導論：生命倫理與文化自覺 Introduction
主題論文	
張祥龍 Zhang Xianglong	王鳳儀倫理療病闡析——儒家生命倫理之活例 On Fengyi Wang's Ethical Cure—A Living Example of Confucian Life Ethics
評論	
張再林 Zhang Zailin	讀張祥龍〈王鳳儀倫理療病闡析〉 On Zhang Xianglong's "On Fengyi Wang's Ethical Cure"
程偉 Cheng Wei	哲學家的冒險——讀〈王鳳儀倫理療病闡析〉 Philosopher's Adventure
蔡祥元 Cai Xiangyuan	〈王鳳儀倫理療病闡析〉一文評析 Review of "On Fengyi Wang's Ethical Cure"
程國斌 Cheng Guobin	從儒家式生命經驗到儒家生命倫理學 From Confucian Life Experience to Confucian Bioethics
王珏 Wang Jue	疾病是倫理中性的嗎？ Is Illness Ethically Neutral?
主題論文	
何懷宏 He Huaihong	預期壽命與生命之道——以當代中國與法國哲學家為例 Life Expectancy and Way of Life—A Comparative Study of Chinese and French Philosophers
評論	
盧風 Lu Feng	“孔顏之樂”、壽命與生命之道 The Confucian View of Happiness, Longevity and Way of Life

沈銘賢 Shen Mingxian	“延續生命 擴大生命”——何懷宏教授〈預期壽命與生命之道〉讀後 “Preserving Life and Enhancing Life”—A Review of He Huaihong’s “Life Expectancy and Way of Life”
張大慶 Zhang Daqing	順其自然 Following the Way of Nature
邊 林 Bian Lin	哲學思維與科學問題——讀何懷宏先生〈預期壽命與生命之道〉一文 Philosophical Reasoning and Scientific Investigation
鄧 蕊 Deng Rui	“壽數”與“文化”的關聯度探析 Relevance of the Connection between Life Span and Culture
主題論文	
David Solomon	Bioethics and Culture: Understanding the Contemporary Crisis in Bioethics [中] Bioethics and Culture: Understanding the Contemporary Crisis in Bioethics
評論	
金理哲 Richard T. Kim	Why Do Bioethics?—Two Questions for Professor Solomon
陳曉陽、王文斐、紀昊一 Chen Xiaoyang, Wang Wenfei, and Ji Haoyi	對生命倫理學相關問題的思考 Thoughts on Several Bioethical Issues
雷瑞鵬 Lei Ruipeng	當代生命倫理學危機的根源及解決方案——David Solomon文章評析 Origins of and Responses to the Contemporary Crisis in Bioethics—Review of David Solomon’s Article
韓 丹 Han Dan	理解認同危機的另一種可能性 Another Possibility for Resolving the Bioethical Crisis
Md. Sanwar Siraj	Beyond Western Conservatives and Progressive Liberals: A Moderate Islamic View

王鳳儀倫理療病闡析——儒家生命倫理之活例

張祥龍

摘要

本文首先介紹王鳳儀的人生，說明其開悟體驗如何塑成他的倫理療病術，並闡釋這種不尋常醫術的特點、哲理基礎、具體方法和一些案例，繼而分析倫理療病的作用機制和條件、它與中醫和西醫的相通與不同處，以及它的適用範圍。另外，本文還集中介紹王鳳儀的追隨者——劉有生對此術的繼承和發展。最後，文章總述這種倫理療病術的儒家性，表明倫理療病可以直接作用於人的生命倫理學。

[目錄](#)

預期壽命與生命之道——以當代中國與法國哲學家為例

何懷宏

摘要

比較中國和法國20世紀以來重要哲學家的壽數，以及兩國哲學家和普通人口平均預期壽命的差異，可以發現一個似乎乖謬的事實：法國哲學家在社會境遇優於中國哲學家的情況下，壽命總的來說低於中國哲學家的壽命。本文推測，這事實主要和兩國哲學家持有的不同“生命之道”有關：即中國崇尚自然中和的“生命之道”，在相當程度上使中國哲學家得享高壽。

[目錄](#)

Bioethics and Culture: Understanding the Contemporary Crisis in Bioethics

David Solomon

摘要

生命倫理學與文化的關係是晚近生命倫理學討論的熱點話題。圍繞着布什生命倫理委員會 (President's Council on Bioethics or Bush Bioethics Council) 的種種風波和爭議，使生命倫理學中的文化權威問題尤為突顯。本文將審查布什生命倫理委員會的性質，並從新的視角解釋為什麼圍繞該委員會的爭論會陷入如此激烈、不可調和的分裂中。我的新解釋是這些分裂與其說是生命倫理學政治化的結果，毋寧說是文化深層分歧在生命倫理學和道德哲學領域中的表達。

[目錄](#)

Abstract

First, this paper presents the life of Feng-yi Wang (1864-1937), a peasant thinker who lived in northeastern China and shows how Wang's experiences of enlightenment enabled him to invent an ethical cure. A serious disease with which Wang had been afflicted for more than 10 years was healed overnight by his sudden recognition that the origin of his illness was not the immorality of his brothers but his own hatred for them and by his profound repentance for this mistake. As a result of this experience, he realized that no universal principles exist for family relationships. Wang underwent two more experiences of enlightenment: the first during a desperate attempt to save a moral friend, and the second during three years spent besides his father's tomb as an expression of filial love.

Second, the characteristics, philosophical foundations and concrete applications of this unusual therapy are explained and some examples are provided. Wang identified the causes of illnesses in disorders of family and other ethical relations, and treated these illnesses by correcting the corresponding ethical disorders. Wang proposed that every human life has three dimensions, heavenly, psychological and desirous. Disease occurs when an individual's heavenly disposition is obscured or damaged by passionate emotions arising from psychological states and/or desire. It has been argued that Wang regarded the heavenly dimension of human nature as embodied in family bonds, exemplified by the parent-child relationship. Wang's method of treatment had three steps. First, the patient was encouraged to recognize the potentially fatal nature of her/his situation, and thus to speak with complete sincerity and commitment to finding a cure. Second, the patient's way of life, especially her/his familial and other ethical relationships, were examined to determine the cause of her/his illness. Third, the patient was told why his/her behavior toward others was immoral and urged to repent thoroughly in front of the offended party, whether a living family member or an ancestor's memorial tablet. Physical reactions to the treatment such as vomiting and weeping were taken as signs that the method had worked and the illness had been alleviated or cured.

The third aim of this paper is to identify the mechanisms of Wang's ethical treatment, the conditions for its success and the scope of its application. According to the Doctrine of the Mean, complete sincerity is the necessary condition for Wang's treatment to succeed. A timely and skillful diagnosis arouses a patient's conscience and encourages her/him to speak sincerely. Therefore, adequate communication is necessary between the diagnostician and the patient. Although Wang's ethical treatment may seem better suited to psychic than physical ailments, Wang's followers argue that it can be used to cure physical injuries. In the third section of the paper, Wang's ethical approach is briefly compared with traditional Chinese medicine and modern Western medicine.

Fourth, attention is paid to one of Wang's followers, You-sheng Liu. In the fifth and final section of the paper, the Confucian properties of Wang's ethical treatment are described and his approach to medicine is shown to directly affect the ethics of human life.

On Zhang Xianglong's "On Fengyi Wang's Ethical Cure"**Zhang Zailin**

Abstract

In this article, a paper by Professor Zhang Xianglong entitled "On Feng-yi Wang's Ethical Cure" is reviewed and explored. Professor Zhang's paper is regarded as a turning-point not only in modern Chinese academic and philosophical discourse on life therapeutics, but in the analysis and interpretation of the relationship between life therapeutics and the integrity of body and mind. In addition, the paper offers insight into the significance of ethical treatment to the discipline of life therapeutics from the perspective of Eastern and Western soma-philosophy.

[Table of Contents](#)

Philosopher's Adventure**Cheng Wei**

Abstract

It remains unclear whether forms of disease therapy that rely solely on ethics or other aspects of human nature can be effective. Claims have been made throughout history for the efficacy of ethics-based medical practices, such as religious treatments. However, it is necessary to scientifically test the claim that such treatments have curative effects. It would be too hasty to accept such a conclusion without sufficient investigation. Indeed, such unthinking acceptance would entirely contradict Confucian values.

[Table of Contents](#)

Review of "On Fengyi Wang's Ethical Cure"**Cai Xiangyuan**

Abstract

The modern discipline of bioethics is usually understood to represent life and ethics as two intrinsically separate fields. In his article, which clarifies the concept of an ethical cure, Zhang Xianglong takes a novel approach to bioethics, regarding life and ethics as closely intertwined. Zhang's main aim is to determine whether ethics-based medical treatments are rational and can be scientifically defended. After rejecting the arbitrary claims of scientism, Zhang indicates that the concept of an ethical cure is predicated on an assumption of the unity of heaven and human beings. Although this assumption seems to oppose the traditional Western philosophy of dualism, Zhang argues that the two schemes of thought offer certain common insights into modern life, particularly with reference to pragmatism and phenomenology.

[Table of Contents](#)

From Confucian Life Experience to Confucian Bioethics**Cheng Guobin****Abstract**

To reconstruct the Confucian moral tradition, we must first understand the ethical nature of human beings and be fully committed to moral practice. The existing research on the concept of an ethical cure shows how Chinese people understand life, medicine and moral and ethical practice, and explores the possibility of reconstructing the Confucian way of life in modern society. However, too great an emphasis on the connection between ethics-based medical treatment and Confucian cultural identity misrepresents the close relationship between ethics and Confucianism.

[Table of Contents](#)

Is Illness Ethically Neutral?**Wang Jue****Abstract**

Professor Xianglong Zhang's paper challenges contemporary bioethical discourse by foregrounding questions that have been ignored by modern theorists. One of these questions is whether illness is "ethically neutral." In my paper, I offer three distinct perspectives on this question. First, I frame the question of ethical neutrality by considering the meaning of illness. Second, I clarify the relationship between ethics and illness. Finally, I discuss the role of illness as a metaphor for aspects of our social and ethical lives. The behavior of the medical profession is commonly linked with moral obligations. There is good reason to believe that the metaphorical relationship between medicine and moral discipline reflects a core dimension of human nature and thus offers useful insights into Wang's "ethical cure."

[Table of Contents](#)

Life Expectancy and Way of Life—A Comparative Study of Chinese and French Philosophers**He Huaihong****Abstract**

The aim of this article is to describe and explain the seeming paradox that although the social situation of French philosophers is significantly better than that of Chinese philosophers, their life expectancy is lower. The lives of important Chinese and French philosophers of the 20th and 21st centuries are compared and the average life expectancy in their respective nations is explored. Based on the findings of this investigation, it is speculated that the most important cause of the abovementioned paradox lies in differences in "ways of life." Compared with French philosophers, Chinese philosophers advocate a more natural and harmonious way of life, which is argued to considerably influence their life expectancy.

The creativity and influence of an individual's philosophical thought do not depend on the length of his life. Longevity is not the highest purpose of life, let alone its only goal. Nevertheless, it is important for individuals to experience full and meaningful lives and reach their natural life ends.

[Table of Contents](#)

The Confucian View of Happiness, Longevity and Way of Life

Lu Feng

Abstract

Professor He Huaihong observes that the lives of famous Chinese philosophers in the 20th century were longer than those of their French counterparts and attributes this phenomenon to differences in these individuals' ways of life and guiding philosophies. I broadly agree with Professor He. However, I make a different claim for the fundamental difference between Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy. According to Chinese philosophy, human beings' supreme goal lies within human life, whereas that defined by Western philosophy is external to human life. According to modern definitions, humanity's ultimate aim is to construct paradise on Earth through scientific and technological innovation and economic growth. The corollaries of this modern goal are that no single individual can ever be satisfied with her/his situation and that society as a whole can never be satisfied by the level of its economy. In short, modernity legitimizes global greed. As a result, many elites in modern society are greedy. However, greedy people cannot also be happy and unhappiness has been statistically linked with unhealthiness. Before the 20th century, most of China's philosophers were absolutely virtuous and capable of remaining peaceful in any situations, and thus usually enjoyed long lives.

[Table of Contents](#)

“Preserving Life and Enhancing Life”—A Review of He Huaihong’s “Life Expectancy and Way of Life”

Shen Mingxian

Abstract

Professor He's paper raises a very interesting question: how does life span relate to way of life? Moving beyond clichéd approaches to health preservation, Professor He innovatively attributes the longevity of Chinese philosophers in the 20th century to their special way of life, informed by traditional Chinese wisdom. In my paper, I use the life history of Shen Congwen to show how we can lead long and prosperous lives. Shen Congwen's devotion to academic research, beginning in 1949, enabled him to maintain his integrity in later life despite his unfavorable political environment. I suggest that independent intellectual self-actualization played a significant role in the happy life enjoyed by Shen and the lives of many intellectuals like him.

[Table of Contents](#)

Following the Way of Nature

Zhang Daqing

Abstract

The author agrees that way of life is an important social determinant of health and longevity. However, an individual's choice of way of life depends more on her/his own understanding of nature and life than on the differences between Eastern and Western culture, because rationalist and empirical traditions co-exist in both the East and the West. Rationalists assume that people are capable of understanding and controlling both nature and the human body, and empiricists argue that people should follow nature. In general, people who attempt to follow nature and lead moderate lives have a high life expectancy and are more likely to be healthy.

[Table of Contents](#)

Philosophical Reasoning and Scientific Investigation

Bian Lin

Abstract

Professor He Huaihong finds a strong correlation between the life span of Chinese philosophers and their particular way of life, informed by traditional Chinese wisdom. Although I agree in part with Professor He's conclusions, I argue that his method is extremely problematic. He asks a scientific question that is beyond the scope of philosophical reasoning. Rather than engaging in philosophical debate, I prefer to find answers through scientific investigation. In this paper, I outline the following three difficulties with Professor He's paper. 1. His comparative method is influenced by scientific reasoning. 2. His selection of a control group is insufficiently detailed and rational. 3. He should expand on the differences between Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy and clarify the relevance of these differences to life span.

[Table of Contents](#)

Relevance of the Connection between Life Span and Culture

Deng Rui

Abstract

Life span is affected by two important dimensions of traditional Chinese culture. The principle that "the Tao follows nature" makes Chinese philosophers tolerant of misunderstandings and frustration. Remaining calm and retaining a positive attitude can increase longevity. The obligation to "subdue the self" urges Chinese philosophers to concentrate on specific things, enabling outstanding achievements and even increasing longevity. However, culture is not the only determinant of life span. Social conditions also affect life expectancy. The comparison with French thinkers is one-sided, as individuals in numerous countries and professions enjoy a high life expectancy. Nevertheless, it is important to adhere to Confucian values to cultivate one's moral character.

[Table of Contents](#)

Abstract

Much attention has been paid to the relation of bioethics and culture in recent years among those who primarily work in bioethics and also among those whose primary concerns are with matters of culture. Why? There are a number of reasons for this widespread interest, and in what follows I hope to explore the variety of these reasons and to suggest some ways of assessing the present state of this discussion. Among the conclusions of my discussion will be that the interplay between purely philosophical considerations bearing on contemporary discussions in bioethics and more general cultural considerations has been of the first importance in shaping recent developments in the emerging academic discipline of bioethics. One cannot ignore developments in academic moral philosophy if one hopes to understand why relations between bioethics and culture have been at the center of so many recent discussions. Also, I will suggest (but hardly establish) that the current unrest in bioethics centered on matters of its relation to culture grows ultimately out of deep cultural divisions and will not be easily resolved by mere adjustments in the methodology of bioethics or by “repackaging” bioethics.

My strategy in this paper will be first to distinguish two quite different sets of issues in the broad area of bioethics and culture and then discuss in some detail the second of these sets of issues. After exploring the second set of issues in a preliminary way I will relate them to some recent episodes in bioethics, in particular the vicious disagreements and lack of civility involved in the reaction of some establishment bioethicists to the deliberations of the Bush Bioethics Council. The depth of the disagreement and rancor in this case has led some to speak of a crisis in the field and of a need for some new methodological orientation for bioethics. Turning to a discussion of some general features of the history of bioethics since its creation half a century ago, I will suggest that these recent disturbances are rooted in features of bioethics present from its beginning. There has never been, as some suppose, a golden age when agreement was easy and mainstream bioethicists spoke with a single voice that commanded universal—or even near universal—assent. I will finally turn very briefly at the end of the paper to two important recent developments in the effort to reorient bioethics—the movement on the part of a number of establishment bioethicists to develop what they call Progressive Bioethics and the sociologist John Evans’s recent proposal to draw on sociological insights to address the crisis in bioethics. I will argue that neither of these reforming proposals is adequate to resolve the difficulties in bioethics that elicited them.

Why Do Bioethics?—Two Questions for Professor Solomon

Richard T. Kim

Abstract

In his fascinating and challenging essay, Professor Solomon provides a forceful account of the current “crisis in bioethics.” In the following comments, I seek clarification regarding the relationship between culture and bioethics by raising the following two questions: (1) What is the relationship between culture and the deep normative commitments that undergird conflicting normative theories? (2) Given the seemingly interminable nature of normative disagreements, what reasons are there to continue pursuing bioethics? The main concern arising from these two questions is that given the deep cultural divisions in contemporary society, as articulated by Solomon, the point of doing bioethics is no longer clear.

[Table of Contents](#)

Thoughts on Several Bioethical Issues

Chen Xiaoyang, Wang Wenfei, and Ji Haoyi

Abstract

The cultural authority of bioethics has recently been subject to fierce debate. Although there appear to be no specific reasons for this deep divergence, it is necessary to clarify the problems and attempt to resolve the crisis. In this article, we discuss some of the points made by Professor Solomon in his recent paper. Bioethics has been culturally and socially rooted throughout its development since the 1960s. It can even be regarded as a kind of cultural product, shaped by diverse national cultures, religions, political systems and so on. However, it is impossible to deny that bioethics today faces challenges arising from multiculturalism and universality. It is important to respect cultural differences while at the same time helping to make global cognition possible. Bioethics scholars must work together to develop the discipline further. We strongly recommend that a balance is kept during this process to ensure a harmonious academic atmosphere.

[Table of Contents](#)

Origins of and Responses to the Contemporary Crisis in Bioethics—Review of David Solomon’s Article

Lei Ruipeng

Abstract

David Solomon proposes in his article that deep divisions in our culture, which are reflected in the variety and opposition of foundational normative theories, are key to understanding the contemporary crisis in bioethics. Solomon examines two recent attempts to respond to this crisis of authority in bioethics and suggest that both proposals make the situation worse. However, his criticism of principlism, which has been dominant in bioethics since the 1980s, seems implausible. As observed by Aristotle, the rationale of a principle-based approach lies in the tensions between generality, considered judgment and ethical deliberation. The principle-based approach to meta-ethics is characterized as a dialectic between moral principles and considered judgment, which is analogous to Rawls’s concept of reflective equilibrium. The four principles formulated by Beauchamp and Childress are prima-facie binding, but subject to specification and balancing. It is possible for us to overcome these deep foundational disagreements in normative ethics by emphasizing the foundational principle held by the ancient Greeks; that is, our natural desire to live a good life.

[Table of Contents](#)

Another Possibility for Resolving the Bioethical Crisis

Han Dan

Abstract

As modern bioethical consumers, we are responsible for developing positive solutions to the discipline’s identity crisis. In many cases, “four-principles” bioethics offers a guide for cross-cultural debate. Optimism is crucial for distinguishing specific moral rules and ultimate moral principles. The observations on which Professor Solomon’s theory is based do not demonstrate that the basic ethical principles of bioethics are culture-bound, merely that specific ethical rules are culture-bound.

[Table of Contents](#)

Abstract

Professor David Solomon examines the cultural conflicts and conflicts in bioethics in the United States. Conservative Christians wish to establish a Western account of bioethics based on their religious view of dignity. In contrast, progressive liberals argue that bioethics should be based on pure reason or rational arguments, regardless of the features of any particular religion or culture. The aim of this commentary is to show that the cultural conflicts and divisions that afflict bioethical debate in Bangladesh are very similar to those in the United States. Moderate Muslims wish to maintain the core values of their Muslim culture and at the same time benefit from the modern development of science and technology. In contrast, progressive liberals, influenced by modern Western traditions, have sought to establish a moral philosophy based on secular reason in the Muslim country of Bangladesh. However, this individualist Western approach is at odds with the Muslim culture of Bangladesh, where non-individualist values are prevalent. In this commentary, it is also contended that the progressive liberals are unreasonably ambitious in attempting to establish universal bioethical norms for Muslim culture regardless of cultural differences.

[Table of Contents](#)