

# "Scientific" creationism - reception of the theory in Poland<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Introduction

Generally creationism is meant as a philosophical view which states that the world was created by God - or pagan god - as a result of a free creative act<sup>2</sup>. The key to the proper meaning of creationism is term 'creation' referring to the action of God. According to Christian philosophic concept it is assumed that the creation is subjective - there was no created object - and objective - no any reason - to grant the object an existence from previous nonentity<sup>3</sup>. It is important to determine the relation between the Creator and the being. The relation between the Creator and being is only mental, appearing beings however really depend on the Creator, for He grant them an existence. It is strongly emphasized with in creationism that the world was created out of nowhere - ex nihilo - and its existence is a constant creation - creatio continua<sup>4</sup>. Such a meaning of creationism is understood in Poland generally within two mainstreams. First, called classic or traditional, reaches back to the works of Aristotle and Saint Thomas. Second, so called evolutionary creationism whose roots should be traced in Saint Augustins views and recently to that of Theilhard De Chardin. But in the recent years one more mainstream has appeared, alien to Polish philosophical tradition, so called 'scientific' creationism, very expanding and thus requiring careful examination.

## 2. Roots and main concepts of two creationism mainstreams

Creationism may be understood in a different way. This differences are mainly ruled by its background which demands references to ontological or metaphysical thesis.

### 2.1. Traditional creationism

The basis of this mainstream are the works of Aristotle. In attempting to explain reality, the philosopher sets forth as follows: if, thus, everything in motion has to be moved by

---

<sup>1</sup> The paper presented in University of Tartu (Estonia), at International Conference: Baer and Modern Biology, 28.02-03. 3. 1992.

<sup>2</sup> A. Lalande, *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la Philosophie*, Paris 1972, p. 194-495.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. Boyer, *Cursus Philosophiae*, Paris 1937, t. II, na s. 396 pisze: stworzenie jest to „productio rei ex nihilo sui et subiecti”.

<sup>4</sup> *Mały słownik terminów i pojęć filozoficznych*, pod red. A. Podsiad, Z. Więckowski, Warszawa 1983, s. 191.

something while the motion agent has, in consequence, either to be moved by something or not, and if it is moved by something else, there should be the first motion agent which is not moved by some other agent. If such a first motion agent is detected, no other is necessary (because it is impossible to exist an infinite chain of motions in which each agent is moved by some other agent, as in an infinite chain there is no first element). If, thus, everything being in motion is moved by something and the first motion agent is in motion, but as a result of an action of the other object, that is it has to be in motion by virtue of itself<sup>1</sup>. Of course the first motion agent, the first engine was for Aristotle the argument reasoning the changing of objects, it creates the eternal motion in an infinite time. Saint Thomas gave that engine a different meaning. For him this was a Christian God. It is clearly seen in his reason 'out of motion' for the existence of God.

It seems that the philosophical explanation of the issue of the world creation by Saint Thomas is tied the issue of chance as well as the existence act<sup>2</sup>. Saint Thomas clearly states that 'we know from our experience that beings can or cannot exist, because they appear and disappear and consequently they exist and do not exist<sup>3</sup>. Those beings does not bear in themselves the reason for their existence, it has to be assumed 'the existence of an existing being because of necessity' the being which does not possess the necessary reason beyond itself but rather creating the necessity of existence of other objects<sup>4</sup>. And this is the relation occurring between the Absolute and the casual beings which determine the deepest sense of the creation. The creation is carried out in a constant relation of the existence of the casual beings to the Absolute. The creation act itself according to Saint Thomas is thus a transfer of the object from the nonentity to the existence<sup>5</sup>, that is the production 'of an object according to its total substantiality<sup>6</sup>. It has to be noted that the 'nonentity' means that neither any created being has existed (subjective nonentity) nor there is any material (objective nonentity). The creation, for Saint Thomas, is of primarily granting the being an existence act<sup>7</sup>. "This is what being created means; to be granted an existence, to exist does not necessarily mean a participating existence arising from the independent existence, this is a nature of being created. Thus God is an independent existence, that is He must be the creative reason or agent granting the existence<sup>8</sup>. In the meaning of a creation there is a key to stress the constant dependence of its existence on the Absolute, not to point out a definite time laps<sup>9</sup>.

## 2.2. Evolutionary creationism

The evolutionary creation may be traced back to some solutions set forth by Saint Augustin. According to him the matter created by God is 'radiated' by so called rationes seminales (founding reasons), which does has a feature of reasoning that is developing the matter by emerging new beings out of it. Of course appearing and disappearing of the being

<sup>1</sup> Arystoteles, *Fizyka*, VIII, 256 a.

<sup>2</sup> K. Kloskowski, *Wieloaspektowy wymiar stwarzania w Summie Teologii św. Tomasza*, Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański XXX, 1987, Nr 10-12, s. 435-443.

<sup>3</sup> I q. 2, a. 3 - wszystkie wypowiedzi św. Tomasza pochodzą z S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa Theologica*, Taurini 1922.

<sup>4</sup> I q. 2, a. 3 and a. 4.

<sup>5</sup> E. Gilson, *Tomizm. Wprowadzenie do filozofii św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, (tłum. z franc. J. Rybałt, Warszawa 1960, s. 57).

<sup>6</sup> I q. 3, a. 5: creatio... est productio alicuius rei secundum suam totam substantiam, nullo preasupposito.

<sup>7</sup> I q. 65, a. 3: res simplex non potest fieri nisi per creationem.

I q. 118, a. 1: omne ens praeter Deum est creatum a Deo,

I q. 45, a. 5; q. 47, a. 1: creare est ex nihilo aliquid facere.

<sup>8</sup> St. Adamczyk, *Zupełna zależność stworzenia od Stwórcy w nauce św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, Roczniki Filozoficzne XIV, 1966.

<sup>9</sup> E. Gilson, *Elementy filozofii chrześcijańskiej*, Warszawa 1965, s. 64-65

takes place within the creative activity of God by *rationes seminales*<sup>1</sup>. The consequence of such an approach to the being are the views of Pierre Teilhard De Chardin which treat the creationism by way of an empiric language of biological sciences<sup>2</sup>. French scientist, according to Kazimierz Kłósak assumes 'the direct activity of God on the nature of objects as a result of which there are simultaneously new creatures within the biology bon, connected with each other physically in their appearing and destiny. The creation act being the act identical with the whole of being, thus with its phenomenal transformation, it does not introduce any intrusion within the mental world, that is new realities, even from the philosophical point of view it is necessary to say, that they are of completely different nature, they do not lack the autecedents and do not imply any termination of the phenomenon process with their appearance'<sup>3</sup>. It is easy to see that for 'Theilhard De Chardin the appearance of a new being is a result of the activity of God and the evolutionary process. By the way the creation is an unification process - an unification act that is creative transformation. The unification act is a centering of dispersed elements which are not connected with each other<sup>4</sup>. Integration of those elements causes their transformation, leading to creation of beings at a still higher stage of existence. So the unification act is identical - according to Theilhard De Chardin - with the creation act. The creation is just gathering dispersed multiplicity. In a coinciding process of cosmogonies the creative 'activity of God is an unification. But to unify, is to get into - into multiplicity - that is to become a particle'<sup>5</sup>

### 3. Polish centers of creationist sciences

Contemporary Polish Catholic scientists go back to the aforementioned sources, supports either the theory of creation in a traditional mode or the evolutionary creation theory. Sometimes it may be seen dependence on each of the theories. Notwithstanding the attempt of that issue analysis I remain only with a short description of the main, I hope, creationistic mainstreams in Polish philosophical literature in this section of the paper. The representation does not claim to be one and only a kind of a methodization systematic of views concerning the creation.

#### 3.1. Lublin scholar

The representatives of the Lublin scholar: Stanisław Adamczyk, Mieczysław Krapiec, Stefan Swierzawski, Stanisław Mazierski, Stanisław Kowalczyk - leaving alone the detailed differences in views on creation in their papers - generally meant the creationism by Saint Thomas. There is important here the proper meaning of the verb 'create'. Create in the meaning of the creation act refers to the whole nature of the object and expresses a total dependence of the creations (the object of the creative act) on the Creator (the creative subject). It is not an external dependence but an internal one<sup>6</sup>. Furthermore the creation (in an action sense) is not a phenomenon which took place in a distant past and has already

<sup>1</sup> A. Augustyn, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duo decim PL 34*, V, 9; VI, 6; IX, 15, 17.

<sup>2</sup> K. Kłosowski, *Kreacjonizm a granice poznania*, Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański XXX, 1986, 7-8, s. 327-340; M. Dołęga, *Kreacjonizm i ewolucjonizm. Ewolucyjny model kreacjonizmu a problem hominizacji*, Warszawa 4988, s. 42-43.

<sup>3</sup> K. Kłósak, *Zagadnienie stworzenia wszechświata w ujęciu Teilharda de Chardina*, *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 1(1965)2, s. 283; tenże, *"Przyrodnicze" i filozoficzne sformułowanie, zagadnienia pochodzenia duszy ludzkiej*, W: *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodoznawstwa i filozofii przyrody* (pod red. K. Kłósaka), Warszawa 1976, t. I, s. 229-230.

<sup>4</sup> P. Teilhard de Chardin, *L'union créatrice, Ecrits du temps de la guerre*, Paris 1965, s. 178.

<sup>5</sup> P. Teilhard de Chardin, *Przeskok myśli: od kosmosu do kosmogonezy*, w: P. Teilhard de Chardin, *Wybór pism*, tłum. z franc. W. Sukiennicka, M. Tazbir, Warszawa 1965, s. 289.

<sup>6</sup> St. Adamczyk, *De existentia substantiali in doctrina S. Thomae Aquinatis*, Roma 1962, s. 108-109.

finished. The creation is the process of granting the existence to objects which rendered the lack of it previously. That process is carried out constantly. The fact of constant creation arises from the necessity of the reason of the object existence being outside them. This what grants such a reason is an independent being, the Absolute<sup>1</sup>.

### 3.2. Warsaw scholar

Within this scholar several different views of the creationism issue are in force. First is represented by the view of Kazimierz Klósak, second is the view of Mieczysław Gogacz, third is the view of Szczepan Ślaga.

The starting point of Kazimierz Klósak on the creationism problems is an attempt to seek the answer for the question 'Is in any extent possible a new scientific approach reaching far beyond the achievements of traditional metaphysics to the Deic creation act in the strictest meaning and thus the creation out of its own nonentity and the subject nonentity - ex nihilo sui et subiecti<sup>2</sup>. The answer of Kazimierz Klósak is double leveling. The first one refers to search of a new, non metaphysical perspective of empiric scientific phenomenology<sup>3</sup> validated methodologically for setting up the views on the issue of creationism. The second level however, refers to establishing, different from metaphysical, term of creation of evolutionary character<sup>4</sup>. The creative act of God sets up new creatures to existence, it does not introduce them rapidly among the existing beings. God, in a way, awakens the forces located in nature, for new beings to be set up from the existing ones. Thus by creation Kazimierz Klósak means 'direct Deic activity on the essence of the objects, in result of which consecutive new existences are born, tied with each other physically in their appearance and destiny'<sup>5</sup>. Such a meaning of creation makes it impossible to refer it to an empirical assumption of the existence of the time beginning of the world, which does not mean that the ontological beginning of the world that is the beginning of existence shall be excluded<sup>6</sup>.

The creation for Mieczysław Gogacz is, by difference, an establishing of an internal existence of the material of the individual being by God. The creation is out of time, is an individual cause of the result and takes as much time as the result. For the created being, the creation is an individual cause of the result, it cease at the moment of starting the individual being by the existence act. This existence act becomes the reality thanks to the creative power of God, an independent existence act, making real and updating interbeing coguidelines<sup>7</sup>.

For Szczepan Ślaga the creationist view does not serve to lock 'the blank spaces' of the contemporary biological science<sup>8</sup>. It is a view, by no means philosophical within which he is attempting to point out the final explanation reason and no contraring the fact of the world and life causality.

---

<sup>1</sup> St. Kowalczyk, *Argument z przygodności na istnienie Boga św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, Roczniki Filozoficzne 21, (1973)1, s. 29-46; S. Świerżawski, *Św. Tomasz na nowo odczytany*, Kraków 1983, s. 80-88.

<sup>2</sup> K. Klósak, *Zagadnienie stwarzania wszechświata w ujęciu P. Teilharda de Chardin*, Studia Philosophiae Christianae 1(1965)2, s. 276.

<sup>3</sup> K. Klósak, *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody*, Poznań 1989, s. 154-156.

<sup>4</sup> K. Klósak, *Poznanie istnienia Boga z pozycji ewolucjonizmu w ujęciu ks. P. Teilharda de Chardin*, W: W. Granat, *Teodycea*, Lublin 1968, s. 263.

<sup>5</sup> K. Klósak, "Przyrodnicze" i filozoficzne sformułowanie zagadnienia pochodzenia duszy ludzkiej, W: *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodznawstwa i filozofii przyrody*, t. I, (pod red. K. Klósaka), Warszawa 1976, s. 230.

<sup>6</sup> K. Klósak, *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody*, Poznań 1989, s. 107-110.

<sup>7</sup> M. Gogacz, *Elementarz metafizyki*, Warszawa 1987, s. 33-43, 175

<sup>8</sup> S. W. Ślaga, *Geneza i stworzenie życia w światopoglądzie chrześcijańskim*, W: *W kierunku chrześcijańskiej kultury*, pod red. B. Bejze, Warszawa 1978, s. 407-420; *tenże*, *Ewolucjonizm - kreacjonizm a panspermia*, Studia Philosophiae Christianae 20(1984)2, s. 111-127.

Szczepan Ślaga assumes that the result in form of the existence of a new ontological form of being or a new way of the existence comes back in equal way and directly both to the First Reason as to material reasons. Such a view on creation as a simultaneous and direct causing the result by two 'reason sets' is developed by Ślaga mainly with respect to the issue of the beginning of the organic life on Earth as well as in relation to the critical valuation of pantheistic creationism set forth by Frederick Hoyle and Charles Wickramasinghe within their theory of the cometary panspermy.

### 3.3. Cracow scholar

Similarly to Warsaw scholar this scholar is also differentiated. The dominating streams are of Michał Heller and Józef Zyciński. The scientists take the issue of creation with respect to either cosmologic theories or analysis carried out in a perspective of a philosophy of natural sciences. Because of that the basic problem is a proper meaning of the view of the eternal creation<sup>1</sup>. Following the views of Jan Stepa they stress that 'it is possible without logical contrary to assume the creation of the world in an infinity because the creative act does not need to have a time character, that is it does not to be meant as the creative reason and of the universe in time precede the result aroused by it.

If we say that the creation act was completed before ages and today is just out of question, we could place the creation act on the time level. We know thus that God does not exist in time and cannot be measured by time. If then the creation was carried out in eternity so it is carried out also at present, because the present lasts. It is not difficult to understand, if we realize that the creation. For the dependence relation of the world on God has not changed, so at present it is the same as it was before the ages<sup>2</sup>. The mentioned above scientists emphasized then that the creationist views do not depend on the definite or indefinite time theory of the universe.

## 4. 'Scientific' creationism

Professor Maciej Giertych in papers published in *Immaculate Knight* (in 1986 - 1987) commenting on Australian author John William George Johnson 'The Crumbling Theory Of Evolution' introduced to Polish literature, so far unknown, new view on creationism<sup>3</sup>. This creational mainstream, alien for Polish philosophical tradition started strong controversies and disputes among the scientific society. Those controversies have increased after book of Johnson was published in Polish after an approval of Warsaw Metropolis signed by Bishop Stanisław Kedziora<sup>4</sup>. It caused a protest of catholic lecturers of philosophy of nature. 'Future form of Polish Catholicism depends largely on present forms of cooperation between the representatives of natural sciences and Christian philosophy. The artificial creation of false conflicts in this respect may cause, in future, unpredictable consequences leading to accusing the Church of anticlericalism against the science. We are afraid of actions leading in that direction and undertaken by ultraconservative fundamentalists, which use the label of Catholicism, for popularizing their private view of Christianity, based on parascientific pathology. Curious example of similar practise is a work of John William George Johnson<sup>5</sup>. As a reply Maciej Giertych set forth among others 'I am rejecting the theory of evolution. I do so as a biologist, not as theologian. By the way I admit that the stigma of the Creator, which I see in nature is more compatible with the Church philosophy concerning creation than the

<sup>1</sup> M. Heller, *Wobec Wszecchwswiata*, Kraków 1970, s. 197

<sup>2</sup> J. Stepa, *Bóg, świat, człowiek*, Tarnów 1947, s. 55 i 57.

<sup>3</sup> M. Giertych, *Upadek teorii ewolucji (I-VII)*, Rycerz Niepokalanej Nr 6, 9, 10-12, (1986) oraz Nr 1 i 2 (1987).

<sup>4</sup> J. W. G. Johnson, *Na bezdrożach teorii ewolucji*, tłum. z ang. J. Kempki, Warszawa 1989.

<sup>5</sup> M. Heller, S. W. Ślaga, J. Turek, J. Życiński. *List*, W: Tygodnik Powszechny XLIV (1990) Nr 24, s. 6.

neck breaking papers of catholic philosophers of nature trying to compile this science with parascience referring to evolution<sup>1</sup>. It is good coincidence that the author of the present paper only in 1984 started the discussion around the basic points of 'scientific' creationists paying attention to a danger of regarding them as catholic scientists<sup>2</sup>. As a scientist and a catholic I could not and I still cannot agree because of essentially methodological reason as well as philosophical ones that the standpoint of 'scientific' creationism are only a supported by my, creationist view.

#### **4.1. The look at the history of 'scientific' creationism and its main assumptions**

Views of 'scientific' creationism have developed especially in the USA since the 20ties<sup>3</sup>. It may be seen several stages of their development. First of all a fight was started for banning the evolution scholarship in schools, later on it was stressed that the creationist and evolutionist sciences should be lectured in schools with equal extent of lessons. The beginnings of the creationist fraction is tied with the activity of William John Bryan (1860-1925) as well as World Christian Fundamental Association set up by William Bernard Riley (1861-1947). Since the 30-ties the supporters of the creationist fraction started to set up their own structure for final spread of their ideas. Only in 1935 'Religion And Science Association' was set up which educated the creationists. In 1941 Calvinist scientists established American Scientific Affiliation (ASA) and in 1963 a dozen members of American Scientific Academy set up Creation Research Society (CRS). The members of the latter Society ought to be Christians and were obliged to swear on the infallibility of the Holy Bible. The activity of the Society focus on proving the non contraries between scientific theories and rules of Christian religion. Scientists united in the Society called themselves scientific creationists<sup>4</sup>. In 1970 Creation Science Research Center (CSRC) in San Diego was set up, a structure publishing manuals, creationist books. Within a couple of years Henry Martin Morris established Institute For Creation Research (IFCR) in which since 1981 one may be granted scientific degrees. The scientific research of the members of that Institute are focused on presenting the arguments impairing the evolutionism. 'Scientific' creationists set forth the view<sup>5</sup> that the Holy Bible is a written word of God and is basis for scientific research, which should be compatible. The basic structure of all living creatures - including man - are the effects of direct creative act of God - taking, according to the Holy Bible seven days - thus all the biological changes started being effective on that day. As a result they state that the biological evolution is a atheistic concept. They directly say that all the living creatures appeared thanks to separate creative acts of God, just as written in the Bible<sup>6</sup>.

Moreover the flood depicted in the Genesis, most commonly called the Noah Flood was a historical phenomenon of a world wide influence. And the Earth is from 60. 000 to 100. 000 years old<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Giertych, *W sprawie teorii ewolucji*, W: Tygodnik Powszrzchny XLIV (1990) Nr 32, s. 8.

<sup>2</sup> K. Kloskowski, *Wokół współczesnej problematyki kreacjonizmu*, Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański, XXVIII, 1984, Nr 7-9, s. 205-214.

<sup>3</sup> R. L. Numbers, *Creationism in 20th - Century America*, Science vol 218 1982, Nr 4572, s. 538-544; J. Skow, *Crearintism as Social Movement*, Science 81, (1981)10, s. 53-54.

<sup>4</sup> A. Montagu, *Introduction*, W: *Science and Creationism* (ed. by A. Montagu) Oxford - Melbourne 1984, s. 5-6

<sup>5</sup> J. A. Moore, *Creationism in California*, W: *Science and its public: The Changing Relationship* (eds. by G. Holton, W. A. Blanpied), Dodrecht Holland, Boston - USA, 1976, s. 194.

<sup>6</sup> St. D. Deck, *Natural Science and Crearionist Theology*, BioScience 32 (1982)8, s. 738.

<sup>7</sup> A. Hammond, L. Margulis, *Crearintism as Science*, "Science" 81(1981)10, s. 55-56; R. L. Numbers, *The Creationists*, Zygon 22(1987)2, s. 133-164.

## 4.2. The attempt of material and methodological valuation

Lubos Belka paid an attention to the fact that in Polish literature it can be find two critical essays analyzing theories of the 'scientific' creationists<sup>1</sup>. It is Andrzej Paszewski and Kazimierz Kloskowski.

### 4.2.1. Critical theories of Andrzej Paszewski

The objections with respect to 'scientific' creationists are set forth by Andrzej Paszewski by criticizing biologic theories included in book of John William George Johnson<sup>2</sup>. It concentrated them in three groups: mistakes and misunderstandings, evidence for evolution found in currently living creatures, evolutions and religion.

1) Determining the age of Earth is made by radioisotope procedure which consists of description the radioactive molecules and the period of its division in a particular material. On the grounds of that research the age of Earth was determined at from 4 bln to 4 bln 500 mln years. Of course those calculations may be mistaken in a way. There is however, not an important mistake which could support a standpoint like that of Johnson that Earth is from 60. 000 to 100. 000 years old. Moreover Johnson set forth that the incontinuity of mud rocks cannot be a result of mountain built movements and transfer of lands, because we do not see such movements at present. As a result he impairs remains of organisms revealed in different geological layers as a prove that one kind of organisms may start the appearance of some new ones. Moreover Johnson makes a fool of himself stating that mutations are the only source of changeability and that an individual mutation may change a scrape into feather or a fly leg into cow leg.

2) The fossil evidence is not an evidence for the biological evolution - says Johnson. Nevertheless even for a plain biologist aware of paleobiologic facts, those materials prove that the genetic code is common for all the living world, from bacteria to a human being. Because of that it is difficult to share the opinion that in every species the identical code appeared independently. Moreover the antropologists are pointing out the similarity, on a molecular level, of many species, for example man and chimpanzee or gorilla. For instance the haemoglobin of a gorilla differs from the human only in two aminoacids, between human and pig insulin there is only one aminoacid. Thus this is reasonable conclusion of the common origin of all creatures living contemporarily.

3) John William George Johnson in his paper says that 'the Darwinist evolution gave Lucifer a formidable weapon do shock the Christian foundations. The man obtained an alternative. He could choose between the creation and evolution'.

Andrzej Paszewski, commenting on that statement, points out that taking into account the evolution is identical for Johnson with rejecting the personality of God and the lost of the moral Absolute. As a result evolutionist theory caused the fall of behavior, modernism, Marxism, laic humanity and so on. Of course evolution theories are used for many populist purposes including fighting the religion. But these are not an efficient reasons to reject it, so far if neck breaking demagogy is used in order to reason its fictitious theories. Johnson set forth aboard the Noah Arc 14. 000 DWT there had to pack many different species. As it was impossible, he assumes that Noe loaded only the youth individuals. Because of that Andrzej Paszewski wonders, what Noe should do to avoid carnivorous animals eat others. Besides the numerous passengers had to suffer serious illnesses because they should take all parasites

---

<sup>1</sup> L. Belka, "Vededky" kreacionismus, Praha 1990, s. 37-38.

<sup>2</sup> A. Paszewski, Czy teoria ewolucji naprawde "się sypie"?, Więż XXXII (1989)7-8, s. 128-137.

attacking man with them, they also were created. Paszewski asks: what about viruses? Did anybody of Noah family suffer from Aids?

So if the Johnson book is meant as an element of a crusade leading to reasoning that God is a creator of everything, the ideas of the author are to be considered as a great misunderstanding. The way of reasoning suggested by Johnson cannot be accepted. Thus the final conclusions by Andrzej Paszewski that the work of Johnson effected with much worse strength than the popularizing the creationist theories is not strange.

#### 4.2.2. Methodological remarks

I would like here to analyze the idea of 'scientific' creationism in a relation to evolutionism as well as the selected features of scientific<sup>1</sup>.

1) 'Scientific' creationists set forth that biological evolution is false<sup>2</sup>. It is a typical mistake of too wide conclusion. The statement concerning the false of biological evolution may be referred either to phenomenal aspect of the evolutionary process and its unevidenced factographic elements or to theoretical aspect and its unreasonable generalizing. It is obvious then for the contemporary biologists<sup>3</sup> that the evolutionism consists of two levels. First is constituted by the theory of evolution itself as a process of development at all levels of matter organization. The particular case here is the biological evolution. Second level constitutes of a different kind of interpretation of the vehicles as well as running the evolutionary processes that is theories. Those two levels are not at the same stage of scientific certainty. So taking into consideration the first level, today no one except 'scientific' creationism doubts that evolution phenomenon is undoubtful scientific fact. It is confirmed by the results<sup>4</sup> of laboratory synthesis dealing with internal similarities and differences of the living creatures construction and classification<sup>5</sup>. Moreover genetic research<sup>6</sup> is of great importance as the paleontology and comparative analysis are on anatomy, histology, cytology, biochemistry<sup>7</sup>. In case of second level it is to be confirmed clearly that evidencibility or falsibility of the evolution theory is an issue difficult for judgement. Nevertheless the evolution theory is not only a description of particular facts<sup>8</sup>. Evolution theory explaining the process of phenomenon occurring on our planet for 4 bln years, allows us to formulate statements exercisable at general level particular to themselves<sup>9</sup>.

2) 'Scientific' creationists assume that the theory of evolution is an atheistic theory and thus they impair the existence of God. It is known that the theory of evolution is determined by a system of statements concerning the history of development of the living creatures as well as

---

<sup>1</sup> K. Klosowski, *Metodologiczne uwarunkowania kreacjonizmu naukowego*, Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański XXX (1986)10-12, s. 434-445.

<sup>2</sup> St. D. Deck, *Natural Science and Creationist Theology*, s. 738.

<sup>3</sup> S. J. Gould, *Evolution as Fact and Theory*, W: *Science and Creationism* (ed by A. Montagu), Oxford - Melbourne 1984 A, s. 118-123.

<sup>4</sup> E. Mayr, *Populacje, gatunki i ewolucja*, Warszawa 1974, s. 13-24 L. Kampfe, *Evolurion und Stammesgeschichte der Organismen*, Jena 1980, s. 27-50.

<sup>5</sup> Th. Dobzhansky, *The Raw Materials of Evolution*, *The Scientific Monthly* 46(1938), s. 445; G. G. Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, New York 1944 passim.

<sup>6</sup> F. Ayala, *The Mechanisms of Evolution*, *Scientific American* 239(1978)3, s. 48-61; S. S. Chetverikov, *On certain aspects of the evolutionary proces from the stnd point of modern genetics*, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 105(1961)2, s. 167-195.

<sup>7</sup> P. P. Grasse, *L'evolution du vivant*, Paris 1973, s. 27-43; E. Mayr, *Evolution*, *Scientific American* 239(1978)3, s. 47.

<sup>8</sup> T. Goudge, *The Ascent of Life*, Toronto 1961, s. 65-79 E. Mayr, *The Growth of Biological Thought*, Cambridge 1982, s. 72.

<sup>9</sup> M. B. Willians, *Falsifiable Predictions of Evolutinary Theory*, *Philosophy of Science* 10(1973) s. 518-537; A. Rosenberg, *The Stucture of Biological Science*, Cambridge 1985, s. 137-139.

the vehicles and rules of their transformation. Consequently the atheism is a theory denying the existence of God. Both those statements related to the assumption two emphasize that according to 'scientific' creationists:

- There is a contrary between the statements of the evolution theory and the existence of God. The evolution theory has to be rejected to retain the religion ideology, according to which God is a creator of everything.

- It may be clearly seen that the 'scientific' creationists do not differentiate the exploration levels. They skip the fact that the knowledge concerning the human being and the world and their origin may be an object of both biological research and philosophical or theological considerations. But the difference is in the way of approach of challenged issues and their reasoning. It does not mean however, that it becomes necessary to reason the existence of God within the biological sciences as well as unchallengeable hostility of the evolution theory and the fact of the existence of God.

3) 'Scientific' creationists reject the evolutionism from the biological reasoning simultaneously attempting the philosophical, theological dogmas that God is a creator by reasoning within those results of biological sciences. It seems that the mistake does not serve well neither the creationism meant in an ontological aspect (understood usually as a philosophical or theological theory) nor the science, for the philosophical or theological dogmas does not need to be reasoned ultraempirically or ultranaturally within the biological views.

4) The ways of quoting the arguments by scientific creationists are of deceptively nature. By the way of deception they cheat the reader by granting their arguments the look of accordance with the results of biological sciences. The lack of positive valuation of facts obstinately rejecting all the reasonable arguments. The construction of the defence of their assumptions on this base shows clearly that the 'scientific' creationists are guided by a very interesting relation: the more emotions, the less knowledge. Especially significant example of such situation is creationist arguments against the laboratory research of the life creation process, their objections with respect to some aspects of the evolution theory. For example the statement 'life could not appear by chance 3 bln years ago'<sup>1</sup> is not absolutely certain if one takes into consideration the results of research on abiogenesis process, laboratory experiments, shaping of theoretical analysis<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, the reasonable discussion is almost impossible to commence<sup>3</sup>, for 'scientific' creationists always may announce that 'we may not achieve anything by way of scientific considerations but only point out that all processes are created by God'<sup>4</sup>. It seems that the cornerstone of such a narrow minded point of view of researched reality is a total ignorance in the scope of the goals of scientific research.

5) 'Scientific' creationism possesses all features of parascience. Parascientists of that team lecture on the structure created by themselves, write papers to magazines established by themselves and publish works if they or their sponsors may set up sufficient financing for the publishing<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, the key rules of 'scientific' creationism may not be executed and its peripheral statements which could be executed become false. Moreover the creationist explanations are based on peculiarities, that is on wonders, not on scientific data<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Morris, *Scientific Creatinnism*, San Diego 1974, s. 49.

<sup>2</sup> K. Kloskowski, *Przypadek jako czynnik abiogenezy*, *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 21(1985)2, s. 39-78.

<sup>3</sup> R. A. Gallant, *To Hell with Evolution*, W: *Science and Creationism* (ed. by A. Montagu) s. 282-305.

<sup>4</sup> D. T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Say No!*, San Diego 1972, s. 3-4.

<sup>5</sup> M. Gardner, *Pseudonauka i pseudouczeni* (tłum. z ang. B. Knyżanowski, W. Zonn), Warszawa 1966, s. 23.

<sup>6</sup> S. J. Gould, *Creationism: Genesis versus 1984B Geology*, W: *Science and Crearinism* (ed by A. Montagu), s. 129.

## 5. Ideological discussion on 'scientific' creationism

According to Antoni Hoffman Polish evolutionists are partly to blame for what happens now in Poland. The main reason is that for several decades the evolution was presented in Poland as a theory that there is no God. But this was a stupid argument, false on the basis. Moreover, no one of contemporary serious theologians does not set forth that the creation of species was an individual act. The Holy Bible does not provide a theory that this was an individual act, but it is rather more natural say about succession in the species creation. And this is the succession, by way of proper understanding the Holy Bible may be meant as process taking many millions or even billions of years<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand Adam Urbanek pays attention on the arguments of 'scientific' creationism, creationism results mainly from religion extremism, not from the scientific theories. That is why the practice of presenting natural evidence by recalling the wholly Bible quotations is so blaming<sup>2</sup>. It is worth nothing that the evolution theory has always a political aspect in Poland and it was lectured as a part of ideologic indoctrination<sup>3</sup>. Besides this aspect no reasonable man can mean the statements of 'scientific' creationists which, among others, evolution is meant as a workpiece of Satan as the entitled and authorized for considering the dispute between the evolution theory and philosophical theory of creation. The attempts of solving that dispute were started in the 60ties aforementioned scientists: Kazimierz Kłósak, Szczepan Ślaga, Michal Heller and the others. My personal point of view is that for philosopher of nature there is a way of conciliation of real factors (vehicles and factors of evolution processes) leading to the appearance of more complex systems and creationist view on the level of either theology of science<sup>4</sup> or evolutionary epistemology<sup>5</sup>. The reasoning of that view goes far beyond the scope of present paper. Moreover it is difficult to understand why God, creating the world, shall be closer to Christian theory, like Johnson provides, than the mighty God supervising the evolution by billions of years. This particular style of arguments of 'scientific' creationists may be summarized in that a potential discoverer declares that he produces catholic *perpetuum mobile* operating by way of holy water<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, Maciej Giertych and John William George Johnson does not believe in evolution and it is their business. However it is not true that creationism is contrary to evolution. The alternative to evolution is the view on the unchangeability of species<sup>7</sup>. Thus it cannot be said that the science (about evolution) is contrary to philosophic or theological theory (about creation). The Holy Bible does not include any scientific information, consequently any detailed sciences does not serve the purpose of philosophical or religion information. Summarizing it has to be stressed that the theories of 'scientific' creationists set forth thanks to Johnson paper implement three monsters into Polish society: ridiculous explanation of the Holy Bible, devaluated Christian science and scientific ignorance<sup>8</sup> and thus they (the thesis) become the startpoint for religion derision. Nevertheless all that what happens around the Polish edition of Johnson paper as well as declarations of Maciej Giertych are probably and shall be contributed in an easier pointing the editions with the interpreting of the Christian science on the uncontrariness of evolutionist and creationist views as well as the literature popularizing the evolution from the biological point of view.

<sup>1</sup> A. Hoffman, *Głos w dyskusji pt. Ewolucja - temat znouu drażliwy?*, W: Nauka i przyszłość 1991, nr 8, s. 5.

<sup>2</sup> A. Urbanek, *Głos w dyskusji*, s. 6 i 7.

<sup>3</sup> T. Bielecki i J. Uchmański, *Głos w dyskusji*, s. 6 i 7.

<sup>4</sup> M. Heller, *Stworzenie a ewolucja*, *Comunio* II (1982)4, s. 58-66.

<sup>5</sup> K. Kłoskowski, *Koncepcje kreacjonizmu w polskich ośrodkach naukowych* W: *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodoznawstwa i filozofii przyrody* t. XVI (w druku)

<sup>6</sup> J. Zyciński, *Ewolucja dla wylęknionych*, *Czas krakowski*, I(1990) nr 125, s. 5.

<sup>7</sup> W. Kossacka, *Fundamentalisci i teoria ewolucji*, *Tygodnik Powszechny* XLIV (1990) nr 38, s. 7.

<sup>8</sup> W. Dyk, *Recenzja pracy Johnsona*, W: *Szczecińskie Studia Kościelne*, t.I., Szczecin 1991, s. 147.

1) The Christian creationism operates in Poland within two variations: traditional (classical) and evolutionary.

A) Traditional creationism. This variation of the creationism by way of philosophical analysis (not the natural ones) it points out the final explanation and uncontration reason of the fact of beings causality (a certain being may exist, but it does not have to). Material, casual being does not posses the reason for its existence. It is not necessary but as it nevertheless exists, it possesses its reason of existence but the external one, in other Being. This Being is necessary. It is the creator because it grants a material existence to other beings.

B) Evolutionary creationism. This variation points out the possibility of connection in a certain methodological and epistemological aspect of the results of natural and philosophical research. This aspect in itself refers to reinterpreting the classical solutions of Saint Thomas while simultaneously utilizes the views of Saint augustine, Pierre Teilhard De Chardin and facing against the results of natural sciences research. With a starting point being the result of this 'facing' this is all what can be said about a certain process, being, from the phenomenal point of view or from the point of view of natural sciences. The results of those views are of hypothetical value, that is they cannot be meant as final, unchangeable, unleverable, but depend on a current development of certain natural sciences.

2) 'Scientific' creationism, as a mainstream alien to Polish philosophical achievements, hardly may be classified as a part of any aforementioned standpoints. Nevertheless formulating their theories 'scientific' creationists are likely to remind a very essential dogma of the Christian creationism, that God is at the beginning of everything. Everything in its existence depends on God. This philosophical (ontological) dogma may be completely misunderstood in the papers of 'scientific' creationists. There are at least two reasons: It cannot be, currently, set forth (without providing efficient stipulations) that the creation is an individual act. It cannot be accepted the way of language, direct interpreting the Holy Bible, it was widely known even at the times of Saint Augustin, if however, one means directly the Holy Bible tale of creating Eve by the bone of Adam, so Adam before the creation would have too many bones or he became handicapped after the creation, such interpreting obviously leads to derision of religion dogma.

3) 'Scientific' creationism means evolution and creationism as two separate and annihilating theories. The alternative to the evolutionism is a view about the unchangeability of species, not a creationism. The scientific theory, that is evolutionary theory is not and may not be contrary to the ontological or religion theory because each of them has a different scope of its dogmatic, different purposes and needs.

4) 'Scientific' creationism skips the fact that the Holy Bible is not a manual of the biological science. At the same time the science based on result of detailed sciences is not an information of the philosophical or religion nature.

5) From the methodological point of view it is accepted to treat the evolutionary theories as well as the creationist theory as complementary assumptions of the beginning and the development of the world and life. It is essential within evolutionism to lie the core in the answer to the question: how (the phenomenon is explained by other phenomenon), the empiric level, within the creationism however, the core should be laid in the answer to a question: why - philosophical level. 'Scientific' creationists asked both questions: how and why on an improper levels. The question: why appears at the phenomenal level, thus it

cannot be wondered the necessity of appealing the "scientific" creationists to wonders in order to explain the sequence and the essence of the appearance of certain natural phenomenon.

## Bibliografia

- S. Adamczyk *De existentia substantiali in doctrina Sancte Thomae* - Roma 1962.
- S. Adamczyk (1966) *Zupełna zależność stworzenia od Stwórcy w nauce Świętego Tomasza* - Roczniki Filozoficzne XIV Nr 1, 17-31.
- Aristotle *Physicae* - Warszawa 1957.
- Saint Augustin *De genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* - Warszawa 1978.
- F. Ayala *The mechanism of evolution* - Scientific American 1978, CCXXXIX, Nr 3, 48-61.
- L. Belka 'Vedecky' *kreacionismus* - Praha 1990.
- T. Bielecki *Głos w dyskusji* - Nauka i Przyszłość 1991, Nr 8, 5-8.
- C. Boyer *Cursus philosophiae* - Paris 1937.
- S. Chetverikov *On certain aspects of the evolutionary process from the standpoint of modern genetics* - Proceedings Of The American Philosophical Society 1961, CV, Nr 2, 167-195
- S. Deck *Natural science and creationist theology* - Bioscience 1982, XXXII, Nr 8, 735-740.
- T. Dobzhansky *The raw materials of evolution* - Scientific Monthly 1938, XLVI, 445-449.
- M. Dołęga *Kreacjonizm i ewolucjonizm. Ewolucyjny model kreacjonizmu a problem hominizacji* - Warszawa 1988.
- W. Dyk *Recenzja pracy Joha Johnsona* - Szczecińskie Studia Kościelne 1991, I, 147.
- R. Gallant *To hell with evolution* - in: *Science and creationism*, ed. by A. Montagu, Oxford 1984.
- M. Garder *Pseudonauka i pseudouczeni* - Warszawa 1966.
- M. Giertych *Upadek teorii ewolucji* - Rycerz Niepokalanej 1986, 1987, Nr 6, 9-12, Nr 1-2.
- M. Giertych *W sprawie teorii ewolucji* - Tygodnik Powszechny 1990, XLIV, Nr 32, 8.
- E. Gilison *Tomizm, Wprowadzenie do filozofii Świętego Tomasza* - Warszawa 1960.
- E. Gilison *Elementy filozofii chrześcijańskiej* - Warszawa 1965.
- D. Gish *Evolution the fossils say no* - San Diego 1972.
- M. Gogacz *Elementarz metafizyki* - Warszawa 1987.
- T. Goudge *The ascent of life* - Toronto 1961.
- S. Gould *Creationism: genesis versus geology* - in: *Science and creationism*, ed. by A. Montagu, Oxford 1984 B.
- S. Gould *Evolution as fact and theory* - in: *Science and creationism*, ed. by A. Montagu, Oxford 1984 A.
- P. Grasse *L'evolution du vivant* - Paris 1973.
- A. Hammond *Creationism as science* - Science 1981, LXXXI, Nr 10, 55-56
- M. Heller *List* - Tygodnik Powszechny 1990, XLIV, Nr 24, 6.
- M. Heller *Stworzenie a ewolucja* - Communio 1982, II, Nr 4, 58-66.
- M. Heller *Wobec wszechświata* - Kraków 1970.
- A. Hoffman *Głos w dyskusji* - Nauka i Przyszłość 1991, Nr 8, 5-8.
- J. Johnson *Na bezdrożach teorii ewolucji* - Warszawa 1989
- L. Kampfe *Evolution und Stammesgeschichte der Organismen* - Jena 1980.
- K. Kloskowski *Koncepcje kreacjonizmu w polskich ośrodkach naukowych* - in: *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodznawstwa i filozofii przyrody*, ed. by M. Lubański, Vol. XV, Warszawa 1992.
- K. Kloskowski *Kreacjonizm a granice poznania* - Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański 1986 A XXX, Nr 7-9, 327-340.
- K. Kloskowski *Metodologiczne uwarunkowania kreacjonizmu naukowego* - Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański 1986 B XXX, Nr 10-12, 423-445.
- K. Kloskowski *Przypadek jako czynnik abiogenezy* - Studia Philosophiae Christianae 1985 XXI, Nr 2, 39-78.
- K. Kloskowski *Wieloaspektowy wymiar stworzenia w Summa Theologiae Świętego Tomasza* - Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański 1987 XXXI, Nr 10-12, P 435-443.
- K. Kloskowski *Wokół współczesnej problematyki kreacjonizmu* - Miesięcznik Diecezjalny Gdański 1984, XXVIII, Nr 7-9, 205-214.
- K. Klóśak *Poznanie istnienia Boga z pozycji ewolucjonizmu w ujęciu Pierra Teilharda De Chardin* - Lublin 1968 - Teodycea, 263-268.
- K. Klóśak *'Przyrodnicze' i filozoficzne sformułowanie zagadnienia pochodzenia duszy ludzkiej* - Z Zagadnień Filozofii Przyrodznawstwa i Filozofii Przyrody, Warszawa 1976, Vol I, 191-236.
- K. Klóśak *Zagadnienie stworzenia wszechświata w ujęciu Pierra Teilharda De Chardin* - Studia Philosophiae Christianae 1965 I, Nr 2, 276-293.
- K. Klóśak *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody* - Poznań 1989
- W. Kossacka *Fundamentalisci i teoria ewolucji* - Tygodnik Powszechny 1990, XLIV, Nr 38, 7.
- S. Kowalczyk *Argument z przygodności na istnienie Boga Świętego Tomasza z Akwinu* - Roczniki Filozoficzne 1973 XXI, Nr 1, 29-46.
- A. Lalande *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie* - Paris 1972.
- E. Mayr *Evolution* - Scientific American 1978, CCXXXIX, Nr 3, 47.
- E. Mayr *Populacje, gatunki i ewolucja* - Warszawa 1974
- E. Mavr *The growth of biological thought* - Cambridge 1982

- A. Montagu *Introduction* - in: *Science And Creationism*, ed. by A. Montagu, Oxford 1984.
- J. Moore *Creationism in California* - in: *Science and its public the changing relationship*, ed. by G. Holton, Dordrecht 1976.
- H. Morris *Scientific creationism* - San Diego 1974.
- R. Numbers *Creationism in 20th century America* - Science 1982, CCXXVIII, Nr 4572, 538-544.
- R. Numbers *The creationists* - Zygon 1987 XXII, Nr 2, 133-164.
- A. Paszewski *Czy teoria ewolucji naprawdę 'się sypie'?* - Więź 1989, XXXII, Nr 7-8, 128-137.
- A. Podsiad *Mały słownik terminów i pojęć filozoficznych* - Warszawa 1983.
- A. Rosenberg *The structure of biological science* - Cambridge 1985.
- G. Simpson *Tempo and mode in evolution* New York 1944.
- J. Skow *Creationism as social movement* - Science 1981, LXXXI, Nr 10, 53-54.
- J. Stępa *Bóg, świat, człowiek* - Tarnów 1947.
- S. Ślaga *Geneza i stworzenie życia w światopoglądzie chrześcijańskim* - in: *W kierunku chrześcijańskiej kultury*, Warszawa 1978, 407-420.
- S. Ślaga *Ewolucjonizm - kreacjonizm a panspermia*, *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, 1984 XX, Nr 2, s. 111-127.
- S. Świerzawski *Święty Tomasz na nowo odczytany*, Kraków 1983.
- P. Theilhard *De Chardin L'union creative, ecrits du temps de la guerre*, Paris 1965 A.
- P. Theilhard *De Chardin Przeskok myśli od kosmosu do kosmogenezy*, Warszawa 1965 B - Wybór pism.
- Saint Thomas *Summa Theologica* - Taurini 1922.
- A. Urbanek *Głos w dyskusji* - Nauka i Przyszłość 1991, Nr 8, 5-8.
- M. Williams *Falsifiable predictions of rvolutionary theory* - Philosophy of Science 1973 X, 518-537.
- J. Życiński *Ewolucja dla wylęknionych* Czas, I Nr 125, 5.
- J. Życiński *Teizm i filozofia analityczna* - Kraków 1988.