

A CRITICAL APPROACH REGARDING TYPES OF REASONING IN EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY AND CREATIONISM

Marius Augustin DRĂGHICI¹, Oana VASILESCU²

Abstract. *In this study we investigated the epistemological presuppositions both of evolutionary biology and of creationism from the perspective of the teleological argument implicit in the concept of function (in the case of biology) and explicit (in the case of creationism). The hypothesis of the necessity of a philosophical-epistemological investigation is proof by means of employing comparative explanation following Kuhn's model of scientific revolution in order to test the claims of scientific character of the biologist theory. Instead of confirming the claims about the "revolutionary scientific character" of Darwinian Theory and denying the validity of Kuhn's theory we have found a systematic redefining of concepts and epistemological claims within the modern evolutionary biology. In turn, in the case of scientist creationism, by adopting and emphasizing the "strong" form of the anthropic Principle conceived as scientific ground for the ideology of modern creationism, we found a theoretical-methodological ambiguity.*

Keywords: evolution, teleology argument, function, natural selection.

1. Introduction

An approach of the man-nature relationship requires in the first place, as we shall see, to lay special emphasis on the precise definitions of both man and nature that are to be taken into consideration. Although the fact that definitions are related with their grounds and, therefore, they are based on the pertinence of the presuppositions and on the accurate character of the deduction, may seem self-evident, it is still necessary to investigate, in the frame of this relationship, the epistemic presuppositions of the theories sustaining various definitions—that we shall discuss further-of these concepts related in the shape of the man-nature relationships. Obviously, we are offering here neither an exhaustive, nor a holistic account, although the nature of the subject itself requires recourse to wide and different realms of understanding and interpretation.

¹Ph.D, Senior Researcher, affiliation: Institute of Philosophy and Psychology C. Rădulescu-Motru (mariusdraghiciinstitut@yahoo.com)

²Ph.D, Associate Researcher, affiliation: Institute of Philosophy and Psychology C. Rădulescu-Motru, (oanavasilescu78@yahoo.com)