

## “Human Personhood” and Embryonic Stem Cells

Recent excellent contributions by Boomsma<sup>1</sup> and Mannoia<sup>2</sup> discuss multiple positions related to human embryonic stem cell (hES) research. Both mention briefly the basic question about such work; namely, when does the fertilized egg (blastocyst) become human. Many Christians agree that “Humanness” is not a biological trait but spiritual or supernatural (i.e., the presence of an eternal soul). At what point is the embryo endowed with a soul? There are no definitive Scriptures answering this question but there are both scriptural inferences and scientifically acquired information pertaining to it.

Studies of reproductive biology demonstrate that more than 50% of blastocysts are lost through failure to implant in the uterus or due to death or miscarriage after implantation.<sup>3</sup> Since the population of the United States exceeds 250 million and the birth rate approximates 14 births/1000,<sup>4</sup> the number of births per year in the United States approximates 3,500,000. A conservative estimation is that an equal number of blastocysts are lost each year. Are each of these lost blastocysts fully human and will their “souls” be in heaven? If so, then a high proportion of the population of heaven will be embryos (perhaps the highest proportion, particularly when one expands these figures worldwide!). Therefore, from the perspective of God’s economy and redemption, it seems highly unlikely that each fertilized egg is endowed with an eternal soul at fertilization.

The question of when the soul is imparted to the human embryo cannot be clarified scientifically. However, there are Scriptures that shed light on this issue. Exodus 21:22, 23 describe a situation in which two men are fighting and injure a pregnant woman so that she has a miscarriage or a premature birth. There are two main positions on the meaning of these verses. In both, the death of the pregnant woman requires the application of the laws of retribution, i.e., giving “life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, etc.” The person causing the death of the pregnant woman must pay with his life. The disagreement about these verses relates to the punishment of the person causing the death of the baby. Clearly, at the time of the writing of Exodus, with the lack of medical expertise, almost 100% of miscarriages and premature births would result in death of the fetus or baby. According to many commentaries, the Scriptures direct that the offender for such occurrences must be fined as the judges determine and the laws of retribution would *not* be in effect. Others interpret these verses to say that the laws of retribution apply just as much for the death of the baby as for the death of the mother. A “middle of the road” position might be that the fetus is not considered human from the perspective of the laws of retribution until it at least is able to survive outside the uterus.

Other guidance comes from passages dealing with the punishment for adultery (Gen. 38:24; Lev. 20:10, 11, 12; 21:9; Deut. 22:21, 22, 24). Here the punishment is always death for the woman. Considering the high frequency of such behavior, it is likely that some of these adulterous women were pregnant or that fertilization had occurred prior to their deaths. Thus, the death of the blastocyst appears to have been of no consequence to the law, suggesting that it was not truly human or endowed with an immortal soul.

Of what relevance does the above information have to stem cell research? Clearly, adult stem cell work is very important, is producing amazing medical discoveries, and should be continued since it does not raise the kind of moral questions associated with embryonic stem cell research. Further, it seems appropriate to question whether the use of pre-implantation or *in vitro* fertilized blastocysts violates moral or scriptural guidelines since 50% or more of blastocysts die from natural causes. A further consideration is that in the medical freezers of our country there are thousands of frozen embryos left over from *in vitro* fertilization procedures and this number is increasing every day.

Research utilizing both types of stem cells appears to have tremendous positive health care potential and the above information should be considered in making decisions about such work.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>R. A. Boomsma, “Embryonic Stem Cells and a Reformed Christian World View,” *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 56, no. 1 (2004): 38–48.

<sup>2</sup>K. A. Mannoia, “An Evaluation of Three Religious Perspectives on Stem Cell Research,” *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 56, no. 3 (2004): 216–25.

<sup>3</sup>Edmonds, D. Keith, K. S. Lindsay, J. F. Miller, E. Williamson, P. J. Wood, “Early Embryonic Mortality in Women,” *Fertility and Sterility* 38, no. 4 (1982): 255–458; and R. G. Edwards, “Recent Scientific and Medical Advances in Assisted Human Conception,” *International Journal of Developmental Biology* 41 (1997): 255–62.

<sup>4</sup>*The World Factbook* (Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 2003).

C. Richard Terman  
ASA Member  
Professor of Biology, Emeritus  
College of William and Mary  
109 Oak Road  
Williamsburg, VA 23185  
dickphyl@aol.com

## Concordism Lacks Concord with Both Scripture and Jesus

Peter Rüst’s letter (*PSCF* 56, no. 3 [2004]: 235–6) contains a few statements which I think need correction. For one, the consensus interpretations of Old Testament scholars across the theological spectrum should not lightly be set aside as a mere appeal to authority. As in any field of knowledge, the opinions of those with the greatest background knowledge, training, and experience ought to be given precedence over the opinions of the less well informed. The private interpretations of concordism are not well informed and have no more right to set aside the consensus interpretations of Old Testament scholars than the private interpretations of creation science have to set aside the consensus interpretations of geologists and other scientists.<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, Rüst says I made a personal communication to him wherein I recommended the commentary by Alexander Rofé, *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch*. This is a misleading statement since Rofé’s book is not a commentary, and I recommended it only as a relatively easy-to-read introduction to higher criticism. I do not agree with everything in the book and very rarely

appeal to higher criticism. He then goes on to identify my view of accommodation with the views of Rofé, Bultmann, and other extreme critics. This is more than misleading, it is misrepresentation of a very serious kind. My view of accommodation is not wildly liberal but a development of John Calvin's view of accommodation, and it stays in principle within his view.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, Rüst says: "Accommodationism leads to unnecessary or even destructive offenses, particularly if moral accommodation is included." Since Jesus understood the implicit permission to divorce-for-any-reason granted in Deut. 24:1-4 as a moral accommodation to the rude cultural mores of the times (Matt. 19:8/Mark 10:5),<sup>3</sup> Rüst's statement makes the accommodationist view of Jesus even more to be shunned than mine. If, on the other hand, Jesus was right in recognizing moral accommodation in the Old Testament, then for followers of Jesus there must be room for accommodation to merely scientific matters as well.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Examples of the private interpretations of concordism can be found in "The First Four Days of Genesis in Concordist Theory and in Biblical Context," *PSCF* 49, no. 2 (June 1997): 85-95, also available at [www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1997/PSCF6-97Seely.html](http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1997/PSCF6-97Seely.html).

<sup>2</sup>See Paul H. Seely, "The Date of the Tower of Babel and Some Theological Implications," part VIII "Gracious Divine Accommodation to Limited Scientific Knowledge," *Westminster Theological Journal* 63 (2001): 32-8.

<sup>3</sup>The majority of commentaries on Matt. 19:8 and Mark 10:5 explicitly say that Jesus saw Deut. 24:1-4 as involving a concession or accommodation. Those remaining silent on the issue give no evidence of disagreeing with the others on this point.

Paul H. Seely  
ASA Member  
1544 S.E. 34th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97214  
PHSeely@msn.com

## A Further Response to Discher and Madden

Madden and Discher's "What Intelligent Design Does and Does not Imply" (*PSCF* 56, no. 4 [2004]: 286-91) and "What Would Count as Defeating Naturalism? A Reply to Van Till" (*Ibid.*, 296-8), continue the vein initiated by Discher in "Van Till and Intelligent Design" (*PSCF* 54, no. 4 [2002]: 220-31) and "Is Howard Van Till's Response to 'Van Till and Intelligent Design' a 'Right Stuff' Response?" (*Ibid.*, 240f), which they cite as demonstrating their accuracy (pp. 296, 298, note 2). This ignores three critiques, two very negative, by Krause, Blount, and me (*PSCF* 55, no. 1 [2003]: 68-70). In "On Discher's Reply to Van Till," I termed his second paper "dishonest" and "sophistry." Why this needs to be said by Van Till to be relevant (p. 296) escapes me.

Their definition of materialism (pp. 287, 289, 296), criticized by Van Till in "Is the ID Movement Capable of Defeating Naturalism? A Response to Madden and Discher" (*PSCF* 56, no. 4 [2004]: 293), is no longer relevant for it ignores complexity theory, also known as deterministic chaos. Systems are readily rendered unpredictable. The authors would profit from James Gleick, *Chaos: Making a New Science* (Viking, 1987), for they apparently did

not understand Van Till's reference to the weather, even though problems with weather prediction are probably the most common example given of chaos. However, much simpler matters can yield nonlinear results and unpredictability.

The authors write: "If it were the case that ID science made a legitimate claim that Darwinian natural selection is unable to explain ... we would be left with a choice between" hoping for scientific progress or rethinking materialism. Consider the situation in which no one can currently present a natural process whereby A has become B, but, of course, ID interventionism can (miraculously?). Obviously, we do not have the required scientific knowledge. But the authors require more for their dilemma: it is impossible to get from A to B by any natural process. This means not just that we will not know, but cannot know of a natural process. To illustrate the matter, of geometry I can confidently say that we will never prove the last theorem. It has been demonstrated that the number of theorems is infinite. But this cannot allow me to declare that a certain theorem will never be known. Yet this requirement is analogous to what the authors require. To continue my analogy, proofs hold only for specific sets of axioms. Axioms may be added or altered. Scientific disciplines are more obviously open-ended, with continued dependence on auxiliary hypotheses beyond the core theory. Euclid's original five postulates and five common notions were similarly dependent on "hypotheses" derived from the diagrams. Hilbert's axiom set is complete, not needing outside information. But such a shift in science with its underdetermined theories and auxiliary hypotheses will not occur, at least not till our glorification.

To apply this to Darwinism, now neo-Darwinism, we find ongoing changes as information arrives from genomics, proteomics, and other areas of discovery. This renders their requirement essentially impossible unless we observe the "designer" zap some creature into an entirely new form. I will expect this, to use the vernacular, when pigs fly.

There is, I believe, another deep problem that the authors have not perceived or, having perceived, deny. Materialism/scientism/ontological naturalism is clearly incompatible with ID, as with my non-ID theism. However, a noted philosopher (whose name I cannot recall) stated that materialism is one of four consistent philosophical views. This means that ultimately it cannot be disproved by anyone. This does not mean that all materialistic positions are consistent. Also, materialism involves more than the simple claim that only matter exists. To be sure, materialism has its problems, but so do all other ultimate philosophical positions. Hence, the aim of disproving materialism by ID is a will-o'-the-wisp, something pursued by those who do not recognize human finitude. I class it as an intellectual task paralleling building a perpetual motion machine.

David F. Siemens, Jr.  
ASA Fellow  
Canyon Institute for Advanced Studies  
Grand Canyon University  
Phoenix, AZ  
dfsiemensjr@juno.com