

---

# Submitted Summaries

---

Filozofia Nauki 14/1, 185-188

---

2006

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

## **Submitted Summaries**

### **Andrzej Stępnik, Popper's third world from the obligingly critical perspective**

In the first part of the paper, the author presents Popper's theory of the objective knowledge and the three worlds in ten theses with a commentary, showing difficulties and vagueness of Popper's theory and trying to clarify it. The second part comprises discussion with a few Popper's theses. The author especially argues against the thesis about autonomy of the third world, and about epistemology limited to examination of only the objects from the third world. In relation to this, the author shows some defects of Popper's argumentation from *Objective Knowledge*. The conclusion of the article is a different interpretation and an anew formulation of Popper's theory.

### **Andrzej Bronk, Religion and Science: Two Kinds of Truth?**

The conflict between religion and science is considered from the point of view of a tension between two types of knowledge: religious and scientific. These are indicative of a fundamental conflict between two attitudes towards the world: looking at the world either from the point view of revelation or natural knowledge. I argue that religion and science can be seen as complementary, not threatening the views of each other. Science itself is neither theistic nor atheistic. It becomes such due to ideological interpretation. Scientific propositions and theories neither directly support nor threaten religion; the problem of existence of God and the supernatural is beyond the capabilities of science. The argument for the neutrality of science can be grounded in the fact that both theism and atheism derive support from science.

### **Jan Woleński, Return to the theory of double truth**

The theory of double truth was proposed in the Middle Age by Latin Averroists as a solution of how the relation between faith (religion, theology) and reason (science) should be conceived. In general terms, according to this theory, there are two orders, one dictated by faith and second dictated by reason. Both are epistemologically different and cannot mutually remain in logical relations such as (in)consistency or entailment. This view was used in the Middle Ages for defending science against a claim that it is the *ancilla theologiae* only. The author compares the theory of double truth with other solutions like the model of identity of science and theology or the model of two overlapping regions (Thomas Aquinas). It is argued that the substantial difference of the language of faith and the language of reason makes logical relations between statements of science and statements of theology impossible. In particular, all cosmological proofs of God's existence as well as projects of intelligent design fail if the theory of double truth is adopted.

### **Piotr Bylica, Complementarity of science and religion**

In my paper I'm going to present and evaluate position that science and religion (Christianity) do not contradict each other and that they rather answer different kinds of questions and solve different problems. Even if they both claim anything about the origin of Universe or human their claims are made from various, independent perspectives. Advocates of complementarity of science and religion state that science is a search for empirical data while religion refers to the domain of values and meaning. In effect they are complementary to each other and their connection gives richer and consistent picture of reality. I agree that there are many problems and questions that are not common to scientific and religious domains, but I'm also going to show that meaning of many religious claims – also the crucial ones – is dependent upon existence of some facts in empirical world included to realm of science. I will also argue that the thesis of complementarity of science and religion is based on discredited neopositivistic picture of science as free from any philosophical commitments.

### **Piotr Lenartowicz SJ,**

The modern concept of science is rooted in a metaphysical option of *materialist* monism. The religious beliefs are inevitably founded on the *pluralist* concept of reality. Hence, the conflict is inevitable. Monism blames religion for producing illusions, while religion accuses the sciences of being epistemologically self-mutilated by their intrinsic reductionism. There exists a third realm of cognition, namely the growing bulk of *knowledge*. It is relatively independent of temporary fluctuations of „scientific standards” and „scientific methodologies”. It is also independent of the religious beliefs founded on some extraordinary, miraculous, „supranatural” events. The knowledge (a sufficiently accurate orientation in the real world) is present both in the highly civilized communities and in the so called „primitive” illiterate populations. Technical achievements confirm the essential accuracy of the knowledge and,

at the same time, give some support to the foundations of teleological concepts and consequently to many of religious beliefs.

### **Robert Piotrowski, Philosophy of American Neo-creationism: On the essence of Intelligent Design Doctrine**

At the beginning of the 1990's the American public debate saw the entry of a new participant: the neo-creationist party, or, as they like to call themselves Intelligent Design. Their activities are not limited to critique of these aspects of scientific culture which are dominated by Darwinian evolutionists. The IDers offer alternative concepts, contradicting both Darwinism and many varieties of theistic evolutionism. Creationists often regard the latter as an effect of capitulation of Christianity before naturalism. The ID propaganda rather tends to avoid open conflict with fundamentalist creationism (mistakenly called *creation-science*), they however imply that their proposals are more serious than flood geology or young Universe cosmology. The latter are regarded by geologists and physicists as *curiosa* targeted at the scientifically illiterate. Neo-creationists even try to announce a coming revolution in *Weltanschauung* of the Western science.

### **Dariusz Sagan, Cardinal Schönborn and the Catholic Church's position on the creation-evolution controversy**

I present a controversy surrounding the cardinal Christoph Schönborn's op-ed article in *New York Times*, titled „Finding Design in Nature”. In his paper, Schönborn challenges the claim that pope John Paul II accepted neodarwinian evolution as a possible method of God's creation of life forms and, especially, human beings. Moreover, cardinal says that neodarwinism contradicts Christian doctrine of creation. In Schönborn's view, neodarwinism excludes the possibility that there is a real design in nature and this is contradictory to the Catholic Church's stand that this design could be and is recognizable by human reason. I argue, just like cardinal Schönborn, that neodarwinism actually is incompatible with the Christian doctrine of creation. I find also that his views, as well as some of the recent utterances of pope Benedict XVI, echoes the claims of intelligent design theory's proponents, who are skeptical of neodarwinism's validity and argue that they formulated scientific methods of detection of design in nature. Therefore, one can have a valid suspicion that these two leading hierarchs of Catholic Church attempt, though not explicitly, to embrace intelligent design theory as an appropriate view of origins for Christians in contrast with the currently dominating scientific view of biological evolution.

### **Zbigniew Wróblewski, Metaphysical traps of a popular science on the example of evolutionism**

The aim of this article is to give a philosophical analysis of inter-theoretical relations between the popular science and philosophy of nature and to formulate and the criteria of evaluation of correctness of such relations. The analysis is grounded in the

domain of contemporary evolutionism. The main hypothesis is the following: The scientific theories do not imply philosophical theses directly. Nevertheless, they frequently appear in popular works as allegedly following scientific theories. For example, papers on the theory of human evolution derive metaphysical theses from certain types of naturalism or spiritualism. These popular, metaphysically loaded, pseudo-scientific theories work as the traps. While using them, it is impossible to realize the cognitive aspirations of scientific theories (the error of metaphysical aspirations) that are suggested in their popular elaborations (the error of naive extrapolations).

Metaphysical aspirations of the popular science result from the social demand for the philosophy of life. The main purpose of metaphysical interpretations is to turn the "scientific world" into the world of everyday life. This can be done in the frame of so-called hobby-philosophies, which are *implicite* loaded with serious metaphysical premises. Philosophy of nature is an open forum for the interpretations of scientific theories. Philosophy of nature takes into considerations theoretical as well as practical human attitudes towards the nature.

**Lilianna Kiejzik,**

The author presents two different accounts of the origins of the Russian philosophy. According to the first one, Russian philosophical thought has grown as an autonomous discipline, whereas the second depicts it as a compilation of trends and ideas borrowed from the Western tradition. The author stresses the religious character of the Russian philosophy, focusing on its two fundamental categories: Sophia (Divine Wisdom) and Godmanhood, that result in an original account of the relation between faith and reason.