ISSN 2299-0356

Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy — **2022, t. 19, nr 1**

Philosophical Aspects of Origin s. 15–19

https://fag.ifil.uz.zgora.pl/index.php/fag/issue/view/21/44

Editorial

Published online: August 18, 2022.

This volume consists of seven articles, two letters to the editor and three book reviews. The articles are arranged thematically.

Part One, which focuses on the evolutionary mechanisms, includes four articles.

Zenon Roskal, in his paper "The Origin of Matter and the Mechanism of Evolution in **Philosophy of Cosmic Evolution** by Feliks Młynarski (1884–1972)", presents Feliks Młynarski's philosophical views on the genesis of matter and the mechanisms of evolution, as contained in the latter's unpublished dissertation entitled **Philosophy of Cosmic Evolution**. Roskal argues that these views — contrary to Młynarski's declaration — are not a kind of ontological dualism, but rather a version of panpsychism known as pan-(proto)-cosmic psychism, which is a form of monism.

Stefan Konstańczak, in his article "The Controversy over Anthropogenesis in Nineteenth-Century Polish Philosophy", presents the philosophical dispute from that time between Karol Libelt and Stefan Pawlicki on the subject of anthropogenesis. This was initiated by the archaeological discoveries in Lake Czeszewskie, a part of Libelt's estate. In fact, the controversy concerned the problem of whether the chronology of human history set out in the Bible could be questioned, or was still relevant.

Theodosius Dobzhansky, in his article "Biology, Molecular and Organismic", notes that fashions and fads come and go in science, just as they do in dress and in headgear. Still, the big question remains: what is man? According to Dobzhansky, this question is topical not because it is hopelessly insoluble, but because every generation must solve it in relation to the situation it faces. In his view, biology will play a fundamental role in answering it: any solution to this problem based solely on biology can be wrong, but certainly no solution that ignores organismal or molecular biology can be either right or sensible. In this article, Dobzhansky's famous statement that "nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution" appears for the first time.

Theodosius Dobzhansky, in his article "Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution", argues that the theory of evolution, which describes a process carrying on continuously throughout the Earth's history, can only be challenged by those who are unfamiliar with the empirical data, or who do not accept it simply on account of emotional resistance or pure bigotry. He also argues that there are no alternatives to evolutionary theory that can withstand criticism. Dobzhansky's arguments for the theory of evolution concern: (1) radiometric evidence; (2) the diversity of living beings; (3) the unity of life; (4) comparative anatomy and embryology; (5) adaptive radiation. He is also convinced that the theory of evolution is not in conflict with religious faith.

Part Two, concerning the problems of reductionism and eliminativism, contains two articles.

Jeffrey Koperski, in his paper "Does Physics Forbid Libertarian Freedom?", notes that three well-known physicists have recently concluded that libertarian freedom is impossible. In their view, free will is incompatible with what we know about science at the most fundamental level. Koperski argues that their arguments presuppose a naïve version of reductionism, and he considers two alternatives, one appealing to mind–body dualism and the other to emergentism. According to the former solution, free will is a capacity of one's mind, an immaterial entity not subject to the laws of nature. According to the latter one, it is an emergent capacity that cannot be reduced to the properties of an agent's constitutive atoms. According to the author, however, these alternatives face the same problem: they seem to violate a fundamental law: namely, that of conservation of energy. The author shows how the libertarian can respond to this objection.

Alexander Rosenberg, in his article "How to be an Eliminativist", argues that modern eliminativism has gained additional support both from the discoveries of neuroscience and as a result of the lack of significant counter-evidence within the currently extensive research on the brain and its components. His article engages in a discussion of the three main arguments against eliminativism: the representation thesis, the thesis concerning the existence of intentional content, and the thesis that it is self-refuting.

Part Three looks at the relationship between natural philosophy and esoteric traditions, and consists of a single article.

Here, Radosław Kazibut, in "Alchemy, Correspondence, and Vitalism: Esoteric Topoi in the Philosophy of Nature", discusses some aspects of the relationship between concepts developed in natural philosophy and in esoteric traditions. This aim is achieved via the approach of Antoine Faivre, who characterizes esotericism in terms of the following topoi: correspondence, vitalism, imagination and mediation, the practice of transmutation, concordance and transmission. According to the author, the analyses of the history of culture allow us to see that the image of nature created in natural philosophy was combined with the image adopted by alchemists, magicians and astrologers. The author analyzes the relationship between alchemy and the philosophy of nature, and points out the presence of the esoteric topoi of correspondence and vitalism in natural philosophy.

The volume closes with two letters to the editor and three reviews.

Paul Davies, in his letter to the editor entitled "Basic Cosmic Question or Is There a Meaning to It All? The Biggest of All the Big Questions", recalls his participation in a discussion on the relationship between science and religion. Among those participating in it were Alfred J. Ayer and the Bishop of Birmingham, Hugh Montefiore. At one point, the discussion became concerned with the problem of ultimate meaning, a question that has troubled Davies for many years. His reflections led him to the following conclusion: "All attempts to explain the physical world, whether through science, religion, mysticism or some other mode of thought, tacitly assume that there is some sort of ground of being in which existence is rooted".

In his letter to the editor entitled "Towards a New Scientific Revolution: A Rejection of Evolutionary Naturalism", Marian Wnuk discusses the editorial activity of the En Arche Foundation. The author stresses that the Foundation, which has

been active for only three years, has already published 19 interesting books. Among other things, the Foundation publishes the *Perspectives on Science* series. This aims to present original views of scientists of the kind that depart from the familiar and the mainstream and seek to offer radically new perspectives in science. Thus, the series shows that science is a composition of various views, hypotheses and ideas rather than some uniform enterprise. The author of the letter poses the following interesting question: "Will the rejection of evolutionary naturalism prove to be as groundbreaking in the history of science as Copernicus' rejection of Ptolemy's geocentrism or Einstein's rejection of classical physics?" Moreover, he notes that the books published by the Foundation themselves "perhaps presage such a revolution".

Albert Łukasik, in his review of Łukasz Lamża's book **Połącz kropki. Nanoboty medyczne, drony zabójcy, odczytywanie myśli i inne technologie przyszłości** [Connect the Dots: Medical Nanobots, Killer Drones, Mind Reading and Other Future Technologies] (Copernicus Center Press, Krakow 2021) entitled "What the Future Will Bring Us", gives the reader an extensive introduction to the contents of this book. Łukasik also notes that this is not just yet another book describing possible technology-related scenarios together with an exaggerated view of artificial intelligence. According to the author of the review, Lamża presents the current state of the technology in detail, citing up to date scientific research while exploring a number of technical issues, which is a huge advantage of this book.

Sławomir Leciejewski, in his review of Cornelius Hunter's book **Bóg Darwina. Ewolucjonizm i problem zła** [Darwin's God: Evolution and the Problem of Evil] (trans. Józef Zon, Perspektywy Nauki, Fundacja En Arche, Warsaw 2021) entitled "Is The Theory of Evolution a Religious Concept?", after outlining the background to the book and discussing its contents, levels a number of accusations against Hunter. The author of the review claims that the latter, an American biophysicist and molecular biologist, tries in various ways to convince his readers that Darwin's theory of evolution has been conditioned by theological concerns right up to modern times. This attempt, according to Leciejewski, is essentially aimed at showing that the theory of evolution is not a scientific concept but a religious one, and that it therefore should not be taught in the United States.

Andrzej Łukasik, in his review of Paul Davies' book **What's Eating the Universe? And Other Cosmic Questions** (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2021) entitled "From the Edge of Time to the Infinite Future of the Universe", notes that the British physicist and astrobiologist has provided there a concise summary of the contemporary state of research in cosmology and particle physics while also setting out the relationship between the sciences and many important philosophical problems. Łukasik also notes that there is some agreement between the views of Davies and Stephen Hawking concerning the problem of the intelligibility of the universe.

Krzysztof J. Kilian