Globethics Repository



Darwinism in the light of Orthodoxy : scientific transformism based on materialism and naturalism

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Istodor, Gheorghe
Publisher	Dialogo / Research Center on the Dialogue between Science & Theology (Romania)
Rights	© 2014 RCDST. All rights reserved.
Download date	2026-11-16 12:05:36
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/3978186

Darwinism in the Light of Orthodoxy:

Scientific Transformism Based on Materialism and Naturalism

prof. Gheorghe Istodor, PhD
Faculty of Theology
"Ovidius" University
Contanta - Romania
pr_george_istodor@yahoo.com

***Abstract*: Darwin and his transformism is the most serious challenge to the religious faith of the Church, initial being challenged the presence and God's creative work in the living universe of the nature, and finally to challenge the existence of God as the Creator, being replaced by an eternal matters and by a blind and random natural process called natural selection. Darwinian theory proposes a dangerous road that starts from deism – with Anglican theistic accents – accepted in his time to an agnosticism and an atheism worst to strike materialism that have an ideological origins placing the foundations of ateization process of many generations starting with modernism, postmodernism and until today.**

Keywords – Darwin, transformism, random mutation, natural selection, theism, deism, agnosticism, materialism, atheism

I. Introduction

When we talk about Darwinism, from the beginning we must say that we deal with an approach that denies the existence of God, both as Creator and Redeemer, and as Sanctifier and Providential God. Thus, the distant origins of Darwinism are not related to science but philosophy in its materialist appearance (we refer to philosophical concepts as the eternity of matter or spontaneous life then taken by modern science to a point, and to the system of Leucippus and Democritus). Then appear theories which claim to be scientific but impregnated with philosophy, such as a theory of pre-formation which still appealed to God and His creation of Benoit Maillet (1656-1738) for the theory of spontaneous generation to return forcefully thanks a Catholic priest, John Turberville Needham (1713-1781), who concluded that the organic matter would have in it a "plastic force" capable of self-generating, meaning to be able to give rise to organized corpuscles. Interestingly, this revival of the theory of spontaneous generation was harshly criticized by Voltaire who could see it directly leading to atheism. This revival has made materialism to take off in its radical form by Buffon, Diderot and Maupertuis paving the way for philosophical vitalism and then to Darwinian Transformism. [1] The fact is that a fierce battle between materialism and deism was given in time, deism as a concept that recognized God in His quality as Creator was adopted by all major modern philosophers (Descartes, Voltaire, Rousseau). [2]

In this confrontation, we have the Cartesian rationalism which not only inclined the balance in favor of materialism and naturalism, but facilitated the replacement of God's revelation (revelation of God as active involvement in human life was excluded) with philosophical metaphysics, opening the doors for ideologies that will paralyze and overwhelm the science of yesterday and today.

II. Darwinism.Theological Review

When referring to Charles Darwin, we can not overlook the young theologian conquered by the theistic system of William Paley, who was "converted" to the natural sciences, came to be the deciding factor for many generations atheisation. [3] We must acknowledge an involution regarding Darwin, from the gentle Anglican theism to deism philosophical accepted in the era, then to the philosophical agnosticism identified with atheism. [4]

His "scientific" system is based on observation and reasoning –fundamental elements in philosophy - not the experiment which exclusively belongs to science. He starts from the observation of horrors in the world that could not be the work of God, but certainly and justifiably deficiencies of a purely natural evolutionary process. Here we see clearly that Darwin's theological training was poor either due to Anglicanism, either do to incomplete studies because the horrors could easily be understood through which theology teaches about the original sin [5] generator of illness, suffering, violence, excessive sexuality and death.

Darwin focuses its system on three elements: chance, struggle and natural selection. [6] Regarding the hazard should be noted that variations allowing gene mutation and lead to the formation of new species are strictly random; regarding the struggle, is about the struggle for survival and the struggle for existence; here is brought to light the adaptation as intrinsic factor of evolution, better adapted species become stronger and defeat in this battle; finally, natural selection is presented - especially by the yesterday and today`s Neo-Darwinists - as a strong mechanism of

evolution, its driving engine, funny is that all advocates of Darwin and evolution endow it with qualities and features alike God, thus we speak of a true naturalist object of worship, in the naturalist universe, too. [7]

When evaluating Darwinism and evolution as a natural process in the attempt to provide an alternative to genuine theological thinking, we can not go around crude forgeries in the attempt to "prove" the existence of evolution. In the attempt to prove the existence of a common ancestor for both humans as well as monkeys, it has tried to find ramifications towards human. This ramification could be australopithecines, namely "Australopithecus Afarensis", which famous skeleton named "Lucy"belongs to. It turned out that it looks more like the orangutan and not human, thanks to researches of great and appreciated anthropologist Zuckerman Lord. But evolutionists have not given up, entering the stage "Homo Habilis" leading to "Homo Erectus" with its subdivisions (Pithecanthrope- man on Jawa) and Synanthropic (man from Beijing). Then is introduced the "Homo Heidelbergensis" found ever since 1856 or the Cro-Magnon Man found in 1868. Humanization of monkeys would include an extensive process with genetic factors (mutations, migrations, etc.), anatomical and physiological factors (biped gait and semi-vertical position highlighting the work with hands), cerebralization(stimulated by labor and creative activity), reproduction throughout the entire year would have favored the multiplication of population, feeding with meat created the necessary energetic availabilities, environmental factors (leaving the life in trees and getting out of savanna) and, finally, the social factors (living and working in the community have promoted articulated language). Moreover, human evolution has not ended, given the potentiality of the human brain, the fact that we use very small part of our brains would enhance future evolution of man.

This entire scheme is a scientifically unproven one, gaps in the fossil treasure is likely to shatter these assumptions. But there were forgeries from amateur anthropologists as Dawson (1953) who produced the false "Piltdown Man", consisting of a human skull and an ape jaw. Then the "Jawa Man" produced by Dubois (1891-1892) who destroyed before his death the gibbon skull cap and the femur of a man found 15 km from it and retracted everything. Then the skull of "Peking Man" artificially inflated to human skull capacity was lost in the moment of its discovery made by Theillard of Chardin,also involved in the false "Piltdown man". Althoughthe "JawaMan" was recognized as false by its discoverer, however, 30 years later, evolutionary geneticist Lewontin still refers to it as a "fact of evolution". In addition, there have been attempts of composition of hominids (of which we come!) based on only a piece of the skull, a jaw, dispersed bone fragments or even a single bone (the "Nebraska Man`s tooth "- 1922 which proved to be of a peccary pig). [8]

We note that current ideologies have replaced actual data, in these conditions we are able to talk about a philosophy of science or even an ideology. As philosophy of science, due to lack of experimental evidence, the evolutionism found its arguments in all areas of science, so it is that rejection of evolutionism and of natural evolution is similar to the rejection of all modern science. As ideology, evolutionism was assimilated by all radical atheistic systems with huge impact on man and society: systems of Marx, Nietzsche, Freud to give just three examples.

III. Instead of conclusions

I noticed that the ground was prepared for the appearance of Darwinism: by eternity of matter and the spontaneous appearance of life from non-life, we have Carl Linnaeus's classification. [9] On the basis solely morphological, Linnéever since 1735 had placed human in "Sistema Naturae" among mammals, alongside primates. The opposability of thumb, a pair of udders and the dental formula 2.1.2.3 have been the arguments for this positioning. More specifically, the man is placed in the subdivision of Catarrhines, alongside monkeys which do not have prehensile tail and claws replaced by nails, then in the Anthropomorphic sub-family, man being the sole representative of the family of Hominids, big apes like gorilla, chimpanzee and orangutan, though lost their tail, they have the same blood types and the same period of the menstrual cycle, plus they can move biped (in a half upright position) belong to the family Pongidae . Here it must be said that the similarities - which are less than the differences - may rather lead to the idea of a common Creator, not of a common ancestor. However, Linné did not suggest the origin of man from the ape, but paved the way of Transformism, 100 years later Darwin had the conviction of this origin, not in "The Origin of Species" (1859) - in which he speaks about anything but the origin of species – but in "The Descent of Man and Sexual Selection" (1871).

However, we must emphasize the emergence and development of anti-Darwinian thoughts in contemporary Biology. First we must say that there is a huge gap of several hundred years in the research between so-called "Sciences of Matter" and "Life Sciences" where Biology is falling, too. Also today, classical, materialist ideological, naturalistic or atheistic concepts - already removed from "Sciences of Matter" - are still the basis of Biology. Thus, those anti-Darwinists thoughts have the importance of a true Copernican revolution [10] in the field of modern Biology. It is about contemporary biologists like Christian de Duve or Michael Denton [11] who opposed to Wilson, Monod or Dawkins [12] – who believed that evolution according to Darwinism is a blind process, with no sense, not being thevector of any project, life being a "cosmic accident" - believes that life is an inevitable phenomenon written in the laws of the universe, a "cosmic imperative" as de Duve said. They evaluate the Darwinian thesis in the light of new scientific, biologic findings and practical certify the restrains and suspicions of many creationist scientists regarding the non-existence of scientific character of Darwinism. Unfortunately, even if they operate fundamental paradigmatic changes within the biological sciences, the two great biologists essentially remain still naturalists, namely under the control of ideological naturalism and still supporters of evolution which means the ideological"bondage" is far from being eliminated soon. In this respect, we must say that after the rejection of Darwinism, evolution is unanimously affirmed by the scientific community within a new theory: the synthetic theory of evolution promoted by a materialist biologist, Ernst Myer. [13]

Reviewing all these stages of imposing Darwinism and natural evolution without divine intervention, we understand

why God became by turn,for the contemporary post-modern man, obstacle to human freedom, useless hypothesis in the postmodern cosmology (see the dialogue between Napoleon the III[rd] a materialistic astronomer Francois Laplace) and not finally the number one enemy of contemporary atheist and sinful man. Even worse is that there are theologians - even Orthodox - who creates confusion in the mind of modern man, by promoting a scientific and religious syncretism of the type of theistic evolutionism, which is even more dangerous than Darwinian evolutionism.

In conclusion, two aspects should make us consider:

If in the name of science, from evolutionist perspective,man and woman become male and female, having their origin and becoming only in materialistic dimension of existence,then why should we wonder that contemporary man behaves - despite his laws and standards of civilization –as a genuine animal. In the light of revelation, theology teaches us that man is the special creation of God and is called to participate forever and ever to communion with the Holy Trinity, he does not evolve, he is intended becoming, videlicet similarity to God – his Creator. [14]

It's bizarre and painful that after 2000 years from the incarnation of the Son of God for our salvation a significant part of mankind, led by some scholars of today prefer to resemble monkeys and not to God, making this choice a priority of their lives, trying to forcefully impose their views to today believer.

References

[1] About this problem you see T. Lepeltier, Darwin Heretics, Bucharest: Rosetti Educational, 2009, pp. 33-55

[2] *Ibidem*

[3] G. Istodor, *The dialogue between theology and science in terms of the Church's mission*, Bucharest: Do minor, 2010, p. 37

[4] *Ibidem*, p. 99

[5] Its Attempting to reconcile evolution with original sin. See D. Alexander, *Creation or Evolution: Do We Have to Choose?*, Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2010, pp. 256-311

[6] To these elements we add the speciation, the fossil, DNA problem and evolutionary gene and reproductive success

[7] J.F. Haught, *Science & Religion: From Conflict to Conversation*, Bucharest: XXI: Eonul Dogmatic, 2008, pp. 69-102

[8] See G. Sandu, *The Evolution to creator*, Craiova: Mitropolia of Oltenia, 2003, pp. 218-223; *idem*, *Science and belief*, Craiova: Mitropolia of Oltenia, 2007, pp. 173-179

[9] *Ibidem*, pp. 216-217

[10] References to the Copernican revolution that imposed in the Alistarh his heliocentrism in astronomy, and improved third century BC Ptolemaic system See J.P. Lonchamp, *Science and belief*, Bucharest: XXI: Eonul Dogmatic, 2004, pp.61-65

[11] See J. Staune, *Science and the Search for Meaning*: *The meeting of the new knowledge with the intuition millennial*, in Science and religion – antagonism or complementarity, Bucharest: XXI: Eonul Dogmatic, pp. 189-204

[12] A clear example of atheist ideology and not scientific approach we have in R. Dawkins, The God delusion, Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2012

[13] G. Istodor, *The dialogue between theology and science in terms of the Church's mission*, p. 57

[14] In this regard see A. Nesteruk, *The Universe as Communion: Towards a Neo-Patristic Synthesis of Theology and Science,* Buchaerst: Curtea Veche, 2009.