

**OVIDIUS UNIVERSITY OF  
CONSTANȚA  
FACULTY OF ORTHODOX THEOLOGY**

**PhD THESIS SUMMARY**

**IDEOLOGICAL EVOLUTIONISM – MAJOR CHALLENGE FOR THE  
ROMANIAN THEOLOGY. APOLOGETIC-MISSIONARY APPROACH**

Realised by Priest Anton Adrian

Under the scientific coordination of

**Pr. Prof. Phd. Gheorghe Istodor**

CONSTANȚA

2012

## **INDEX**

### **I. INTRODUCTION. THEME TIMELINESS**

### **II. THE SCIENTIFIC, PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVE OF CHARLES DARWIN**

#### **II.1. DARWINIST „TRANSFORMISM” – FUNDAMENTAL BENCHMARKS**

#### **II.2. DARWINISM – SCIENTIFIC HYPOTHESIS, SCIENTIFIC THEORY OR SCIENTIFIC TRUTH?**

#### **II.3 THE DARWINISM – THE TRIUMPH OF IDEOLOGICAL NATURALISM OVER THE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH?**

#### **II.4. CHARLES DARWIN’S RELIGIOSITY AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTS**

##### **II.4.1. DARWIN’S „THEISM” OR THE ANGLICAN PROTESTANT HERITAGE**

##### **II.4.2. BENCHMARKS OF PHILOSOPHIC INVOLUTION OF CHARLES DARWIN: FROM DEISM TO AGNOSTICISM.**

##### **II.4.3. THE RAPPORT OF THE DARWINISM WITH THE PHILOSOPHICAL MATERIALISM AND ATHEISM**

#### **II.5. DARWINISM FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ORTHODOX THEOLOGY**

### **III. SCIENTIFIC – RELIGIOUS SINCRETISM: THE THEIST EVOLUTIONISM . OVERVIEW**

#### **III.1. THE THEIST EVOLUTIONISM REFLECTED IN THE MINDS OF SOME WESTERN AND ORTHODOX THEOLOGS**

#### **III.2. THE THEIST EVOLUTIONISM – ORTHODOX MISSIONARY ASSESSEMENT**

### **IV. „SCIENTIFIC” CREATIONISM - „RELIGIOUS” ALTERNATIVE FOR THE DARWINIST EVOLUTIONISM**

#### **IV.1 . „SCIENTIFIC” CREATIONISM – ISSUE AND DEVELOPMENT**

#### **IV.2. „SCIENTIFIC” CREATIONISM – IDEOLOGY OR SCIENCE?**

#### **IV.3. THE REPORT OF SCIENTIFIC CREATIONISM WITH ORTHODOX THEOLOGY OF THE CREATION**

### **V. „DESIGN PROJECT”- WESTERN ALTERNATIVE TO THE DARWINIAN EVOLUTIONISM**

#### **V.1. THE RAPPORT BETWEEN THE „INTELLIGENT PROJECT” AND THE CREATIONIST IDEOLOGY**

#### **V.2. “THE INTELLIGENT PROJECT” FROM THEOLOGIC PERSPECTIVE**

### **VI. SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONSEQUENCES OF EVOLUTIONIST DARWINISM:**

#### **NEW-DARWINISM**

#### **VI.1. NEW-DARWINISM- OVERVIEW**

#### **VI.2. NEW-DARWINISM OR ATHEISATION IN THE NAME OF SCIENCE**

#### **VI.3. THE SYTHETIC THEORY OF EVOLUTION AND NEW-DARWINISM FROM ORTHODOX PERSPECTIVE**

VII. APOLOGETIC-MISSIONARY ASPECTS TOWARDS THE SECULAR ALTERNATIVES FOR THE UNIVERSE AND HUMAN ORIGIN	
VII.1. MISSIONARY ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SECULAR ALTERNATIVES REGARDING THE ACT OF CREATION	
VII.1.1. ATTITUDE TOWARDS EVOLUTIONISM AND CREATIONISM	
VII.2. NON-DARWINISM OR THE CHANGE OF PARADIGM IN THE CONTEMPORARY BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH	
VII.2.1. THE RAPPORT BETWEEN NON-DARWINISM WITH IDEOLOGICAL NATURALISM	
VII.3. MISSIONARY SOLUTIONS FOR FIGHTING AGAINST TEACHING EVOLUTIONISM IN THE ROMANIAN EDUCATION	
VIII. CONCLUSIONS	

**Key terms:**

**Theory, Hypothesis, Darwinism, Creation, Evolution, Image, Likeness.**

## **II. INTRODUCTION. THEME TIMELINESS**

In our society, every human being, irrespective of the place where he was born and grew up, of his social position, of his level of qualification wondered at least once “where he came from” or “from where the things that surround us appeared”. Thus, over the centuries, by asking themselves such questions and after some analysis sometimes poorly studied, relying more on their own intellect and ideas, people have been trying to find an answer as close to the truth as possible, at least according to their views. In this way, Aristotel believed that man developed from fish, then other philosophers and erudite of the Antiquity, followed afterwards by those of the Medieval and Modern Age, claimed that life evinced by itself, from mud or in other conditions, and, similarly thought that man appeared from smaller constitutions. At the end of the Modern Age and in the Contemporary Age the idea of “life self-formation” was modified and called The Theory of Evolution, named afterwards even scientific. The flimsiness of these ideas has been every time easy to prove. It is essential that such statements as the ones above to be processed and analysed, and then officially presented, as in the case they are false, a great part of the population or even entire generations will live supporting a lie.

In the Contemporary Age, now when the humanity reached a level of development superior to the one from previous ages, the danger that people be indoctrinated with a lie is much higher, as between the two basic theories about life emergence – Creationist and Evolutionist, the latter being exposed in high schools, colleges and universities as the original presentation of genesis and anthropogeny, especially during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Theory of Evolution being named scientifically, has charmed the minds of numerous people, while the theory of creation has been frequently abrogated from the educational system. One of the main reason is the limited number of proofs, as if this fact could be precisely proved. This is a very big mistake as after studying thoroughly these two theories we notice that they both base on faith – it is necessary that we do believe in them excepting the fact that none of them

detains empirical, tangible proofs; moreover the science from the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century contradicts strongly the Theory of Evolution and supports the ideas of the latter.

The Mechanist Conception fostered the huge scientific and technological progress that the western contemporary society knows, but this conception is the cause of the spiritual and moral downfall of the world we live in.

The Theory of Evolution claims that either God doesn't exist or He exists but he is not present in the act of creation. But a God that does not create does not have reasons to imply in redemption and also does not have the conditions created by Himself for Embodiment. Basing on the world and human independence towards God, modern age has logically concluded the following: the world can be perceived as a whole without any implication of God, irrespective that we speak about the God of believers or the One of the philosophers.

The evolutionism appears in modernism and postmodernism context and the impropriation in the name of the civilisation, desacralization and dechristianization caused its incubation. Thus, the impropriation in the name of the civilisation appears as an idol whose worship appears in the modern age and consists in culture, art and moral values subordination, tradition and faith in God towards the need for civilisation. All these things led to the deification of human rationality and to its presentation as substitute for the belief in God.

Nonetheless, signs of hope evinced from where we expected the least, namely in the domain of fundamental physics, which outstripped the existence of thing by itself and the mechanist relationships between things, of cause and effect, promoted by classic physics. The new physics discovered that there are no things by their own, but all of them are in a relation of mutuality, in order to build that interior and profound order we have mentioned above. Of course that the outcomes of quantum physics can be interpreted and used by everybody, at their ease, as it really happens.

We saw that the evolutionism appears in the context of modernism but its "founder" is the naturalism that allows human deification and God or transcendental denial or of every type of supranatural being. The modern man decides it's time to declare his independence from God and church, that he creates the law and that he is the owner of the world and history, in order to apply his plan of universal domination. Embracing materialism and assisted by scientific revolution, the man abandons in this century the Holy Spirit giver of life, and convicts himself to death. For him, the Holy Bible represents no longer a standard of morality offered to him by Holy Revelation, but human nature with its tendencies becomes the absolute standard of morality.

The philosophical naturalism became the framework for scientific research and influenced the objectivity of scientific undertaking and its outcome. Darwin evolutionism was one of the premises for dialectic materialism settled by Karl Marx. Marx, Engels, Lenin and other famous representatives of modernism created the platform for mass crimes of which communism and Nazism are accused, known in history as most inhuman ideologies.

An odd enough media plan has been outlined in recent years, that tries to promote evolutionism and other theories which dig permanently to the base of written Word, erodes with doubts sneaked insidiously, or which avers with pseudo-scientific courage all kinds of poisoned mixtures meant to destroy spiritually, to lose those people with weak belief or those whose belief stands on shifting sands, mostly through documentary oriented channels such as: Discovery Channel, National Geographic, History channel, Viasat explorer and so on.

These documentaries in their majority present our solar origin where the celestial bodies were thought to be our father and mother, the sin does not kill the soul, the man does not have to account for his sins to nobody, Heaven and Hell do not exist at all; the manuscripts from Qumran are presented as certain proofs that question the Godhead of Jesus Christ, that the Virgin Mary is not a Virgin, that Joseph is the real “father” of Jesus, that the Virgin Mary had had more children or that Jesus Christ lived in concubinage with Mary Magdalene. And not the least, after all this campaign to promote materialism through human and entire creation desacralisation, the idea that the rescue of the man, of the planet and of the whole universe does not come from God but from technology has been amplified. It is offered all kind of scientific and technological alternative to human’s desire to live more, to be happy, to thrive. But God will never appear in such a documentary as a rescue and a solution for humanity, not even at spiritual level.

Both evolutionism and theistic evolutionism come and destroy the reality through which the man is a complete being, always the same, in all times, taken by the Son of God for our redemption. The acceptance of evolutionism is the denial of Jesus Christ embodiment and of the fact that Jesus Christ is a God and a complete human being. Starting with this idea, we are trying to prove in this paper that the evolutionism is transformed in an ideological system.

## **II. THE SCIENTIFIC, PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVE OF CHARLES DARWIN**

At the beginning, the religious conceptions of Darwin were dominated by natural theology of the philosopher theologian William Paley, known for his teleological argument,

according to which the adaptation of the species alive are the action of God over the laws of the nature. Although reticent towards his opinion about religion, in 1879, Darwin declares that he has never been an atheist, by denying the belief, but rather agnostic.

The evolutionism comes to embrace philosophical forms once with the effort to build a new religion. The theistic evolutionism, The Intelligent Project, the new Darwinism and the anti – Darwinist trends constitute only a part of the theories created by Darwin's project. If Darwin's theory about life origin is on one side permanently completed by new discoveries of fossils and reliquiae, there are many people that contradict it with religious, cultural and political reasons.

Much information about his religious thoughts and actions, but also about the way he developed his scientific personality or about the philosophical systems he appreciated can be found in his "Autobiography", or as he calls it himself, "Memories about my character and thinking development".

Darwin confesses that a part of his intellectual and moral heritage comes from his father and grandfather. Young Darwin was persuaded both within family and at school about the existence of God and about soul immortality. Though, as he admits, it seems that the religious feeling has never been powerfully developed inside him.

One explanation for the fact that Darwin dropped off the belief in God, and let the disbelief enter step by step in his soul is the consequence of the fact that he never thought of God as a personal existence, as a personal God, but trying to know him through rationality – being also assisted by the Anglican doctrine which practiced a moderate Protestantism - did nothing but to install forever the disbelief in his soul.

Beyond any actions as the ones above, Darwin's belief was shaken by painful personal experience. First of all we should mention the death of his mother, that scarred his childhood, followed by his worst experience ever of everlasting suffering and painful death of his favorite daughter Annie in 1851, at 10 years old.

Darwin's religiousness was an involution from a certain Anglican theism to deism, passing through the pure theology of William Paley. From the philosophical point of view, Darwin got to balance between philosophical rationalism, agnosticism and even atheism, in the last part of his life, the last two conceptions being practically undistinguishable. Scientifically, the route covered by Darwin from biological naturalism incurred by his grandfather, to his evolutionist conception, precisely limited by Lamarckian evolutionism.

## **II.1. DARWINIST „TRANSFORMISM” – FUNDAMENTAL BENCHMARKS**

In the 19th century, the transformism got to reign through Darwin, it became a philosophy, a metaphysics through the monism of Ernst Haeckel. He directed transformism to new routes, aiming to explain philosophically the fundamentals of darwinist dogmata, thus darwinism becoming a philosophy and a religion. But soon after Darwin and Haeckel's trial to put Darwinism on higher positions, it could be noticed a downfall of the enthusiasm for transformism. Supporters of transformism separated in two: Newlamarckians and Newdarwinians.

Subsequent to Weissman's discoveries about the non-hereditary transmission of gained characters, or experiences undertaken by Hugo de Vries over genetic shifts, their papers embedded mostly the renewal of antitransformist conceptions.

The transformism started from the idea that the science includes mainly causal explanation, in the sense of mechanical determinism of the efficient causes. Lamarck and Darwin highlighted this postulate. That's why the transformists oriented towards materialism, fact that mainly compromised the doctrine. Many thinkers support the idea that the organic nature expected another explanation than the one limited to cause and mechanic.

Lamarck and Darwin are one of the founders of the transformist theory. However, this theory has many gaps. In their book about „The Theories of Evolution” Yves Delage and M. Goldsmith speak categorically about the transitory character of all systems, showing that every theory, every system proposed inside transformism can revendicate a value for the fact that it brought into discussion factors that play a role in life evolution. Though, the transformism that base on modern natural philosophy leaves from teleological finality problem. The great problem of transformism was the blind preoccupation to demonstrate biologically life apparition and to forget a very important thing, namely that all that happens in a body is maintained by a vital force (via vitalis) that works for some objectives, such as soul.

Both Darwin and Lamarck are interested in the descendance phenomenon but each of them concentrated on some factors. Lamarck highlighted the environment and the heredity and Darwin over natural selection. They both commit the same mistake by approaching such an important problem by making use of scientific rationality.



## **II.2.DARWINISM – SCIENTIFIC HYPOTHESIS, SCIENTIFIC THEORY OR SCIENTIFIC TRUTH?**

A major reason for the resistance towards the Darwinist explanation of species evolution is that this does not fully satisfy the requirements that researchers of the nature and theoreticians of scientific method derive from a certain concept, a restrictive one of the scientific knowledge. They proceed with the fact that the theoretic and experimental science of nature, in the way she has developed from Newton on, she represents the science by excellence, consequently the model that every research needs to follow in order to be called „scientific”.

The scientific method or the scientific process is fundamental for the scientific investigation and for acquiring new knowledge based on physical proofs by the scientific community. The erudits use observation and rationality to propose interim explanations for phenomenon, called hypothesis. In the presumption of methodological materialism, the noticeable events from the nature (inclusively artificial works of the humanity) are explained just by natural causes, without supposing the existence or non-existence of supernatural. The forecasts derived from these hypothesis are tested through different experiments, that should be propagable. An important aspect of the hypothesis is the fact that it needs to be falsified, in other words, we should be able to check if it can be false or not. If the falsity of a sentence cannot be verified, then that is not an hypothesis, but an opinion or statement that resides beyond the domain of scientific research. It is also well to be known that an hypothesis cannot be proved or datae from an experiment mainly conceived to test an hypothesis can either support or reject an hypothesis.

Opinions are split about darwinism. For ones this is a scientific hypothesis that did not succeed to be proved and whose supporters try to transform in a scientific truth that cannot be proved or in a pseudo-religious dogma. The darwinism supporters name the evolutionism to be the scientific theory that belongs to the empirical science just at the microevolution level, for which they offer a framework for explaining things such as the occurrence of variation when small populations are isolated from the main species population. But that the evolutionism to be a scientific theory it had to verify an hypothesis supported by this one. A theory is formed just by „scientific method”. This is formed of more steps such as: a certain phenomenon is noticed, more and more datae about that phenomenon are collected, an hypothesis is formulated and basing on this explanation, some logical conclusions can be drawn and checked experimentally. Then experiments are developed in order to confirm or deny the conclusions of the hypothesis, and in the case when the experiment confirms the conclusions of the hypothesis, it is repeated by another scientists. If the same results are obtained by the other scientists, a new theory has been born.

But some theologists claim that the darwinism is nothing but a form of atheism that stood at the base of hitlerism and communism. The material and atheists ideologies like scientism proclaimed the darwinism as scientific truth, but analysed objectively, this cannot be qualified but as an scientific hypothesis.

## **II.3 THE DARWINISM – THE TRIUMPH OF IDEOLOGICAL NATURALISM OVER THE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH?**

Ever since its emergence, the darwinism implies God's death, preparing the replacement of biblical religion with a new belief, based on evolutionist naturalism. The new „belief” was to become the base not only for the science, but also for governing, law and morality, as official religious philosophy of modernism; in reality, Darwin's speculations almost relied on its observation and not on the one of evolution but on the species variation.

But not only Darwin had such preoccupations, the problem of human origin and the one of universe kept occupied the minds of thinkers and philosophers from all times starting with Anaximandru and Empedocle , Aristotel and Lucrețiu , Magnus and Mettrie , Diderot and Lamarck .

The naturalism is inherently anti-theist, by rejecting the main notion of a God in person. Consequently, many people think that the naturalism has nothing to do with religion. Actually, this is a common mistaken belief that the naturalism means scientific objectivity. The naturalists themselves pretend that this concept is scientific and superiorly intellectual in order to prove that their system is in opposition with eberything that bases on belief and this is how their non-religious character emerges.

It is known that due to the theory of evolution, the naturalism is the dominant religion of modern society. Although the majority of Darwin's theories about the mechanisms of evolution were rejected long time ago, the evolutionist doctrine itself succeeded to realise the state of a fundamental article about faith in popular modern mind. That's why in some people's soul the christianism was replaced now by naturalism, especially in the occidental world, and the evolutionism became a dogma of the naturalism.

The darwinism has produced a tentacular school, which on one side has forced the science to sustain the unsustainable and on another struggled permanently to ridicule the idealist opposition. It is sustained that the evolution is by definition „non-oversighted” and this „requirement” is not a conclusion that darwinist reached through empirical proofs, but a philosophical presumption that reflects their start point from metaphysical naturalism or materialism. If the nature is the only thing that exists, then it should be able to give birth to its own creation. This implies the existence of a natural evolutionist process capable of forming very complex things starting with the simple ones. Initially, the process didn't have to be conducted, as a mind able to conduct the evolution should have evoluated itself from a material substrat. After the evolution of human beings, the evolution can be considered to be conductedm through practising eugenia (forbidding procreation) and of genetic engineering.

The proofs brought in by the evolutionists in order to support the theory of evolutionist naturalism are not scientific but make part from a certain logic imposed by them. Thus, the darwinist transformism is a conglomerate of philosophical ideas followed by some scientific assertions, which is closely related to Charles Darwin's ideas and philosophical conceptions but also with its changing religiosity and purely rational.

## **II.4. CHARLES DARWIN'S RELIGIOSITY AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTS**

Charles Darwin's religiosity has been an involution from a certain Anglican theism to deism, passing through the natural theology of William Paley. Philosophically speaking, Darwin arrived to oscilate between philosophical rationalism, agnosticism and even atheism, in the last part of his life the last two conceptions were practically undistinguishable.

From the philosophical point of view, Darwin oscilated, starting with the theism and reaching agnosticism. If in his years as a student accepted theism as a conception about world and life, which presupposes that God exists and can be met, he later replaces the theist theory about life with a new one – the deism. The deist God is only a force or a creative energy but not a personal being that wishes to be in relation with the human being.

Towards the end of his life, as he confessed himself, he declared himself as agnostic. The agnosticism is the philosophical belief according to which the veridicity of some statements, especially theological statements about the existence of God or other Gods, is either unknown or impossible to be found out. The agnostics can declare either that the spiritual knowledge cannot exist, or that they do not have such knowledge at all. In both cases, the scepticism towards religious doctrines is exposed.

Nonetheless, there are atheist clues of atheist thinking in case of Darwin. He considered himself in a certain moment of his life to be a Christian, but some time later he abandoned the Christian belief and God due to some tragedies in his life. The theory of evolution has been „invented” by an atheist. Darwin's scope was not that of denying God's existence, but he reached this conclusion for sure by launching the theory of evolution. The evolutionism is the primary motivation for atheists. Today's evolutionists cannot admit the fact that their scope is that one of offering an alternative explanation at life's origin and to provide thus a fundamental for their atheism.

### **II.4.1. DARWIN'S „THEISM” OR THE ANGLICAN PROTESTANT HERITAGE**

Apart from deism and pantheism, the theism represents the most adequate form for the religion, that's why only in this way we can discuss about a religious report with divine being. A creator God, but uninterested in the faith of His creatures, as in deism, cannot be the object of the religion as it diminished the opportunity of creating this report; and an unpersonal God and in relation with the world as in pantheism cancels the man and personal report and also the characteristic freedom of a religious act. Only in theism this report can be possible fully and in real form. The term of theism is frequently used as synonym for monotheism.

As we have already mentioned, C. Darwin, is part of a family of unitarians, that participated at religious messes, from the chapel of reverend G. Case, but along with his brother he was baptised in the Anglican church. Even if C. Darwin went to the primary school under the authority of the Anglican church and studied theology at Cambridge, he received some of these unitarian ideas and emerged later in the theories he conceived.

In Darwin's heart a picture of the living world as a world of peace and harmony, the expression of the intentions of a merciful and loving Creator, the image that was cultivated by the religious tradition in which he has grown and in the natural theology. The separation of the image was done gradually, with inner turmoil and struggle under the pressure of the respect that genuine researcher owns to controllable facts. The queries and questions aroused from the observations from our trip appear as latent germ, the expansion of Malthusian vision over living nature as decisive impulse, the close contact with artificial selection practices as the exceptional opportunity for articulation and testing new principles of explanation. Personal experiences that have shaken the faith and led him to atheism add to all these above.

And gradualism, the recognition of the role of chance and the dissociation of the idea of the evolution on earth to the one of progress can be considered to be orientations of thought that enabled the development of what is to be "the selectionist model of evolution" opposed to the "instructionist model", that comprises also creationism.

## **II.4.2. BENCHMARKS OF PHILOSOPHIC INVOLUTION OF CHARLES DARWIN: FROM DEISM TO AGNOSTICISM.**

The situation in which man increasingly substitutes himself to God and builds his world and his own way of life according to his laws and not to the divine ones is derived from an autonomous cosmology in which man, though he proclaimshis his faith in God , adds and casts Him in an isolated inaccessible transcendence.

This conception in which man affirms his belief in a God who created the universe, but then withdrew, isolating the man and the world, a God who is not providentially, is called deism. The deism is often confused with God's absence in creation.

This cosmology, the way it has developed and acquired new meanings over time and its practical consequences, is based on the ancient philosophy dualism, the opposition between the sensible and the intelligible world which was taken in the West by St. Augustine. He developed in his doctrine the theory about the seminal reasons within creation, they being some external effects to God that autonomise the world in relation to God.

The Augustinian thought was taken by the Francs who wanted to impose a thought different from the East and then from the scholastic theology that focuses on rationality separating the theology from spirituality, the systems of theory and the life lived. In the Middle Ages, the scholastic philosophy and theology, through an exaggerated rationalism come to form systems where God is reduced to a mere abstract idea.

The deism of Rene Descartes denied any trace of God in creation, the only remaining vestige understood was the pure spirit and soul detached from all things in creation. The enlightenment is an episode in which the man isolates from God in an autonomous culture, dominated by a cosmological determinism that has transformed the world into a machine. From teocentrism he goes to anthropocentrism, where man does not need God. Thus the deism hit in the Christian faith and preceded the acute phenomenon of secularization from nowadays.

This is the framework in which Darwin developed as a thinker and man of science and the transition from theism to deism and then to agnosticism gradually occurred under the influence of his time way of thinking or under the influence of his work and in his attempt to reconcile theories issued with his beliefs.

The agnosticism appears in the philosophical thinking as a direct result of the Kantian conception of limits and possibilities of knowledge about the existence of the Divinity. Darwin tries to explain this choice by saying that a man who has a strong belief and who believes in the existence of a personal God – or of an existing or future punishment and reward, may follow his principles of life of those impulses and instincts which are the strongest or which seem to be the best. Following certain social impulses or instincts man can get major satisfactions, and acting for the good of others he will receive his comrades' approval and will win the love of those with whom he lives.

He had trouble of reconciliation between God's purpose with the current human condition to struggle to survive at the harsh realities of life. Because Darwin's principles and the results to deny his religious faith, Darwin was labeled as an atheist. But Darwin did not deny the existence of God, he considered Him to be unknown. See how in Unitarian ideas because they lack relationship with a personal God, the faith of Charles Darwin, also in small proportions is lost and it is headed towards a cold deism and a sickly agnosticism. Thus, God is reduced to a principle can not be denied without too much exertion.

### **II.4.3. THE RAPPORT OF THE DARWINISM WITH THE PHILOSOPHICAL MATERIALISM AND ATHEISM**

Materialism is the most serious attempt to banish God from the mind and body of human beings. Materialism becomes an atheistic foundation through dictatorial communist ideologies based on philosophical materialism that attempt to demonstrate evolution of the ancient materialist conception to the dramatic development of the communist "satanology".

At the end of 16<sup>th</sup> century and early 17<sup>th</sup> century, England emerged a strong current of materialism which has developed fruitfully along sec. 17<sup>th</sup> and a part of 18<sup>th</sup> century. English

materialism is represented by philosophical theories of Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke.

The book "Systems of nature" by Jean Baptiste Mirabaud, anticlerical and anti-Christian, explicitly atheistic, is considered the main source of modern atheism and French biologist Jean Baptiste Lamarck was the first to offer a comprehensive version of the theory of evolution. Lamarck's theory, later repudiated, states that living things evolved by pure hasard, by gradual variations, over time.

Charles Darwin resumed and popularized Lamarck's view in a somewhat different form. Repeating the ancient myths, Darwin says that life would have appeared "by itself" from inanimate matter (through a process called "spontaneous generation") adding that all species evolved by pure chance from a common ancestor, along time.

Darwin's theory lacked a scientific basis. Despite this, she soon gained widespread support. But not in the scientific world, but in the political circles of the dominant powers, who understood its ideological implications and used it as justification for their policy imperial .Darwin built his whole theory of evolution on the concept of "struggle for survival".

According to him, a bitter conflict, a bloody struggle dominated the world of nature: the strong always win against the weak, thus ensuring the survival and development. Since the late 15th century, the Europeans began to colonize different parts of the world. After the Spanish, Portuguese, and Dutch the British took part in the "competition" of colonisation. The situation Situația changed throughly in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

With the development of materialistic doctrines, people began to ignore the fact that they were created by God. This was the birth of modern racial theory, whose scientific basis was even Darwin theory of evolution. The Nazi ideology relates to the evolutionary theory and with the materialist philosophy. The evolutionist theory of the Nazi philosophy had the central idea the concept of Eugenics.

Materialism has been a major victory in the 19th century by two German philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the founders of communism. They tried to explain to materialist philosophy in the terms of a new method: the dialectic. Pure atheists, both philosophers harbored a deep hatred against religion, arguing that eradication is absolutely necessary for the success of communism.

The Darwinist dark legacy left to humanity manifested by brutal dictatorships. Violence, terror, racism, persecution and war - these are the natural consequences of Darwinist-materialist attitude to man and mankind. This syncretistic philosophy that regards man as nothing more than an animal species, which puts all hope in material things and who

promotes conflict as an immutable law of nature led to commit the greatest crimes in human history.

## **II.5.DARWINISM FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ORTHODOX THEOLOGY**

The dispute evolutionism - is not equivalent to creationism and evolutionism meeting with the Orthodox theology of creation. First of all the framework is different. In the first case a dispute of ideas between two perspectives that need to be argued scientifically, such as the dispute of the creationism evolutionism - scientific. In the second case there is an intersection of a philosophical doctrine that needs to be proved scientifically, with a gesture of respect for orthodox theology which is a testimony of faith, a doxological value on understanding the world in respect of creation of a Creator. This gesture is not science and does not seek justification from the outside through import of any credibility in space sciences. The Creationism appears in the Protestant doctrine which is based on a literal reading of the essay concordist and biblical testimony is different from the Orthodox world with the sense in his Creator, God.

There is a distinction between creation theology and creationism. Any ideological component tends to the profound significance of theology of creation. World Creation implies a Creator God who made and sustains the world, leading it to its ultimate meaning. Different religious traditions imply the creation of the world. From a Christian perspective, God is at once Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier of the world.

Trinity people participate together to the creation, redemption and sanctification of all existence. Patristic tradition testifies that all creation is structured and fulfilled in Jesus Christ, which is the world Pantocrator. The reason and the ultimate meaning of the world is Christ-centered.

Dispute creationism-evolutionism is either an ideological dispute (see versions of creationism and evolutionism "scientific") or purely philosophical (in the register of conceptualized mind), while meeting scientific theory (whether evolutionary) - is a theology of the creation act pertaining to the relations between theology and sciences. The two approaches, scientific and theological, have different skills as method of knowledge, objectives and means.

Supporters of the creationist ideology are mainly Protestants, the ideal being to turn the Bible into a scientific book, which, interpreted literally, would provide a more objective science than the secular one, of divine origin. The literal lecture has no relation to time Philokalia Orthodox tradition. If you can speak of internal consistency of the Bible and the Bible itself ecclesial tradition, we can not avoid recognizing the spiritual approach Philokalia true interpretative key - corresponding to the ecclesiastical Christology - the Bible.

However, this approach is not concerned with any creative technology, aiming only to highlight the spiritual dimension of the biblical message and therefore its existential implications: human rebirth in Christ.

We do not think we can speak of "evolution" in the human species, precisely because Orthodox anthropology has a strong Christological component element used often as an argument by proponents of evolutionary anthropology. If Christ is the archetype and at the same time, each man *Theos*, virtually every Christian is the man *hristoformised*. Quality is a gift that has to be updated and not a foreign state human nature that, in order to achieve, would require "morphological changes". On the contrary, deification presupposes acquisition of winning natural condition of being human, human deification means fulfillment and perfection in Jesus Christ and not a morphological transformation. Transfiguration and incorruptibility of the body are inherent to human nature deified, which can be properly understood only in a proper sense of the divine-human synergy principle used, moreover, that the argument of supporters of evolutionary anthropology.

### **III. SCIENTIFIC – RELIGIOUS SINCRETISM: THE THEIST EVOLUTIONISM . OVERVIEW**

Some people today prefer a middle approach for the subject of origins - a concept generally known as theistic evolution, evolution of religion, evolution attenuated or spiritual evolution. So when someone claims to be a theistic evolutionist he says that he believes in both: in God and in evolution at the same time.

There are a lot of personalities that ranged between theism and naturalism, especially between 1600 and 1750. Rene Descartes, a known theist, opened the door, conceiving the universe as a giant mechanism of "matter" that people understand with their "mind". He thus divided reality into two kinds of existence, at that time, the Western world which was hard to see as an integrated whole. Naturalists, seeking a path to unification, head turned into a sub-category of mechanistic material.

Incompatibility of the modern theory of evolution and belief in a God actively involved did not seem to be a logical order - we can imagine that God established laws of nature and placed into operation mechanisms of evolution by natural selection with the intention that you and I to appear once - but there is an incompatibility of inner order. After all, religion arose in the minds of those who spoke first causes omniscient, but in the hearts of those who crave constant intervention of God actively involved.

We note in conclusion that science ideology destroys the meaning and the purpose of the scientific instrument, talk about something else than the science as a research and an objective description of the universe of God's creation.



### **III.1. THE THEIST EVOLUTIONISM REFLECTED IN THE MINDS OF SOME WESTERN AND ORTHODOX THEOLOGS**

Pope Pius XII in his encyclical "Humani Generis" says: "The Church does not prohibit research and development doctrine talks from specialists in both areas as long as it is recognized that the origin lies in the human body and pre-existing living matter." Catholics were free to accept the theory of evolution but were asked to believe that the soul is the work of God because by definition is a spiritual soul, which implies that it was created by God and was not brought into existence by transforming matter (unlike the body).

After Vatican II, it is resumed the topical poligenism. To reduce tensions between traditional creationist understanding monogenism is imposed (all humans are descended from a common ancestor: Adam and Eve) and the evolutionary approach which requires default poligenism will call a division on two different levels: this is the difference between theological genesis and biological genesis. It is therefore proposed acceptance of a theological monogenism but in fact it is considered that it was poligenism biologically speaking. Primitive Adam (an entire population actually) rebelled against God, this thing is a myth told in book form Genesis. In a speech to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Pope John Paul II stated: "The new findings lead us the recognition that evolution is more than a hypothesis. "

Despite the evolutionists, theists' attempts to convince the common man and the academic community that evolution and creation are complementary, the pressure is still there. And because the two cosmovisions claim the same intellectual territory: the origin of the universe and humanity's relationship with it - Conflict is therefore inevitable. Orthodox theologians are unfortunately affected by this syncretism as Dr. Kalomira Andrei Kuraev and others.

### **III.2. THE THEIST EVOLUTIONISM – ORTHODOX MISSIONARY ASSESSEMENT**

Theistic evolutionism is a heresy as it blatantly contradicts the revelation of Creation, narrated in Sacred Scripture and the Church Fathers about it. All these issues base on the allegorical or literal interpretation of Holy Scripture. Those who use allegorical interpretation of Scripture have tried to give credit, ascribing to them their own ideas, changing the meaning of the words of Scripture with the use of figurative language. Mean to make yourself wiser than the Holy words, when, by way of interpretation of Scripture, the Scripture enters your ideas.

Theistic evolutionism is, theologically, evolutionary theory Trojan horse that attempts

to hide atheism and relativism under the guise of heretical theology and the scientific is a ridiculous attempt clandestine God put it in the plan of creation.

Supporters of theistic evolutionism are not aware that all their teaching of evolution is rooted in atheistic theory of evolution (naturalism), and that everything has its foundation in a lie can only be a lie at least as large as possible, no matter how gilded with biblical quotes taken out of context. Here, it is absurd for those who want to stick to the lie with the truth, which is the philosophy of evolution with the truth revealed in Holy Scripture.

#### **IV."SCIENTIFIC" CREATIONISM - „RELIGIOUS"ALTERNATIVE FOR THE DARWINIST EVOLUTIONISM**

##### **IV.1 ."SCIENTIFIC" CREATIONISM –ISSUE AND DEVELOPMENT**

Scientific Creationism creationism is a discipline which attempts to provide scientific support for the Genesis description of the occurrence Universe and disapproves facts, theories and generally accepted scientific paradigms about the history of the Earth, cosmology and biological evolution. Scientific creationism science for a demonstration using literal truth of Scripture, influenced by neo environments in which it developed.

The main ideas in scientific creationism is the belief in "creation from nothing" belief that the earth was created in the last ten thousand years, the belief that humans and other life forms on Earth were created that types of "bataminologic" fixed distinctive ideas that fossils found in geological strata were deposited during the flood which completely covered the entire earth.

Another dispute was related to the introduction of scientific creationism in public schools. The teaching of scientific creationism in the public schools in the United States ended in 1987 following the decision of the Supreme Court *Edwards v. Aguillard* United States. The Court stated that teaching scientific creationism with evolutionary theory, as long as evolutionary theory already being taught in public schools in Louisiana was unconstitutional because the only scientific creationism role was to promote particular religious beliefs.

Scientific Creationism argues that it is impossible to prove scientifically any conception of origins, because the essence of the scientific method is experimental observation and repeatability. A scientist may be ingenious and inventive, but he can neither observe nor repeat origins. It is therefore important that each person has a philosophy of origins to mental health, and this can only be based on faith.

From the outset, scientific creationism strategy was to not show off how much Bible contradicts evolution, but how much it contradicts scientific evidence. Immediate success and influence to have done these evolutionists to resume offensive caricaturizing creationists and accusing them of religious partisanship, not to profess their religious partisanship.

#### **IV.2. „SCIENTIFIC” CREATIONISM – IDEOLOGY OR SCIENCE?**

Scientists, regardless of the model you must embrace the will to follow the evidence wherever it leads. All must recognize that scientific inquiry is likely to move sinuously even give back, because that is the nature of science, a thrilling and self-corrected, but net limited knowledge approach. It is limited so incomplete knowledge of the facts and the finite capacity of man to assemble facts that have a rational pattern.

Creationist model can be simplified as three inferences based on scientific observations, in other words, based on inferences that are based on scientific facts. Thus, our knowledge of DNA and proteins in living cells, biochemistry and mathematical probability suggests that life is the result of God's creation and not time and chance acting on the intrinsic properties of matter. Then our knowledge of genetics, ecology, homology, embryology and the types of life that we find as fossils suggest that separate and distinct types were created each full features that a mosaic, each with a large variability, limited in the types .

Analyzing the two fundamental laws of science, first and second law of thermodynamics can be viewed with complete certainty that the creationist model prediction tools, telling us a cosmos conserved quantity, but quality decays. These laws not only indicate a primary creative but they seem to eliminate any significant amount of progress "upward" anywhere on the scale of history.

Thus, the current laws of science directly draw attention to a primordial creation, but the profound conflicts with the philosophy of natural development continue. The creationist is so much more "scientific" than the evolutionary model.

#### **IV.3. THE REPORT OF SCIENTIFIC CREATIONISM WITH ORTHODOX THEOLOGY OF THE CREATION**

There are some voices who wonder what the difference between science and biblical creationism is. States that the first answer is based solely on scientific evidence, and the

second is based on biblical teachings. Genesis text includes an overview of creation in six days, the name of the first man and the first woman, the curse of God upon the earth because of human sin and other references that will never be proven scientifically. Scientific data can still argue over creation but there is no scientific way to determine the duration of that period. For a long time they were placed in opposition to faith with science, "obscurantism" of "enlightenment" that even believers have come to believe in chic unbelief. And to embarrass a lesser or greater extent, the Indemonstrabil, the mind is above or, to mix things going after scientific evidence of the existence of God. For so long they kept repeating that religion is irrational atheists that believers have come to seek evidence of its rationality, the scientific style demonstrabilității Truth.

From the Orthodox perspective cosmologiateonomă than unilateral specify both evolutionism and creationism. Cosmology theonomic distances himself both decreationism and evolutionism. Can not accept creationism, who believe that the world was perfect from the moment of its creation, coming into conflict with evolution, nor does it accept evolutionism, because he believes that the world itself sedezvolta unrelated to God.

Honest scientist should say where it stops scientific investigation, without seeking any way to bring scientific reason which is not placed in the field of scientific investigation, much less impose jump to revelation. An atheist can also stop here without being obliged to accept further waiting best possible scientific solution. But Orthodox Christian must take the next step, the step from science to faith, and confess God the Creator. A Creator which manifests as some might think wrong, only where science no longer enough, but at least from the perspective of orthodox and what science has explained correctly but the works of God transcends all that can be known to man naturally is kept conscious of this fact, acknowledging our limitations and respecting the mystery.

## **V. „DESIGN PROJECT”- WESTERN ALTERNATIVE TO THE DARWINIAN EVOLUTIONISM**

Intelligent design is the assumption that certain features of the universe and life are best explained by an intelligent cause, not by indirect processes, such as the selection naturală. Este contemporary adaptation of the teleological argument for the existence of God, but one that

deliberately avoids specifying the nature or identity of the designer. This is the antithesis of the intelligent design movement that seeks to identify clear examples of a project in living organisms, taking them forward as evidence of a designer.

There are three main arguments for Intelligent Design Theory: irreducible complexity, specified complexity, and the anthropic principle. The anthropic principle states that the world and the universe are "fine-tuned" to allow life on earth. If the proportion of elements in the atmosphere would quickly change, many species would cease to exist very quickly in response to this. If the earth had been placed just a few miles away or closer to the sun, too many species would cease to exist. The existence and development of life on earth involves so many variables that must be perfectly in line with each other that it is impossible that all these variables occur as a result of random, uncoordinated events.

### **V.1. THE RAPPORT BETWEEN THE „INTELLIGENT PROJECT” AND THE CREATIONIST IDEOLOGY**

First of all, as in the case of "creationism", we also face here great semantic difficulty. Both words "intelligent design" involve a wide range of interpretations of how life on this planet was born and the possible role played by God in the process. But "intelligent design" became a specialized term which implies a very precise series of conclusions about nature, especially the concept of "irreducible complexity". Who does not know this substrate might consider that anyone who believes in a God who cares about human beings (i.e. theistic) actually believes in intelligent design. But in the current terminology, this would be false in most cases. The intelligent design movement is careful to not specify who would have been the creator, but the Christian view of most leaders of this movement implicitly suggests that this power would come from God himself.

### **V.2. “THE INTELLIGENT PROJECT” FROM THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE**

On the surface, objections to Darwinism launched by the intelligent design movement are not surprising that people without thorough scientific training, especially among those seeking to find God's role in the evolutionary process, warmly embraced these arguments. If scientific reports would build exclusively on logic, and then we might expect that

researchers in biology are interested in following these ideas, especially in the context of biology, a significant number are believers.

The essence of this theory suffers because of the fact that it provides the mechanism by which postulates supernatural interventions would lead to complexity. The science made substantial progress, especially in detailed study of the genomes of many organisms from many different parts of the tree of evolution. Major cracks begin to appear, suggesting that followers of this movement have made the mistake to confuse the unknown with what cannot be known or what has not yet been solved which is impossible to solve. God appears in a new stance, this time ordering the world that providence by which all things follow their goals.

Addressing issues related to the beginning of our world not so fine science performance as it may be, but by divine revelation. True knowledge of this subject is given by the Holy Ghost Fathers continuity, sent to those who have labored spiritually to take the spiritual view which Moses received the revelation, and what the Fathers interpreted in the light of the Spirit of truth. The problem starts having the world beyond scientific premises and claiming a uniformity of processes and physical laws. From the perspective of spiritual Fathers events took place before the Fall after another logic than can operate after the Fall.

## **VI. SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONSEQUENCES OF EVOLUTIONIST DARWINISM: NEW-DARWINISM**

### **VI.1. NEW-DARWINISM- OVERVIEW**

The new-Darwinism represents all manifestations based on three fundamental principles elaborated by Darwin namely heredity of acquired characters, individual variations observed in each population and the principle of natural selection and also the struggle for existence. After Neo-Darwinist concept mutations are always random and independent from one another. This makes it impossible to explain the emergence of complex organs and adaptations. Given these difficulties by Neo-Darwinists, some of them try to explain evolution by genomic mutations that the phenomenon of polyploidy.

Lamarck, considered the father of evolution, theorized the transformism that tried to explain that God made the world, but it has changed, turned to reach the current state. Darwin based his theory of evolution by showing that the living world has turned into geological time, from lower forms, simple and complex shapes reaching beyond. Factors of Darwinian evolution have been analyzed in many ways, have been eliminated or hypertrophy, while appearing multiple theories. Some of them have demonstrated the principles of evolution. Not surprising that there are many Neo-Darwinist and Neo-Lamarckism theory.

Referring to mutations of nature and environmental adaptation Grigorie Sandu Father said: "Mutations in favor of an entirely new plan cannot expect one another, as thousands of mutations can accumulate to create a favorable organizational new plan and it would be time-consuming. Can be tolerated only variations which do not affect the overall organization. Geneticist Goldschmidt proposed - Monster bringer of hope - that a mutant that would suddenly, if not all, at least most of the necessary mutations that may be a future opportunity.

But still genetically demonstrated that the probability for development through favorable mutations successive time intervals starting in the hundreds of millions of years available, is extremely small, with as little will be a chance to show that a considerable number ever ! resulting theory was rejected. Goldschmidt's anti-darwinist position because he clearly natural selection contest a significant role in the emergence of new species. These three inseparable ingredients - random battle and blind natural selection - suggests that the universe is impersonal, completely unrelated Christian God "involved". But what's worse, many of Darwin's scientific descendants did not hesitate too long to identify evolution with atheism.

## **VI.2.NEW-DARWINISM OR ATHEISATION IN THE NAME OF SCIENCE**

The phenomenon of variation and natural selection explain the evolution not only as Darwin believed that it does, but it really is a wonderful example of creationist principle of conservation in action. That is, a creationist model prezicerefundamentală of is that since the Creator had a purpose with every body set, he had to establish a system to ensure the integrity of not only genetic but to make one able to survive in nature .

Genetic system should be such as to maintain the identity of that particular species, but at the same time, allow it to adapt features (within certain limits) by environmental changes. Otherwise even the smallest changes in its habitat in food sources etc. could cause the disappearance of that species.

It is significant that no new species of plants and animals evolved on earth when calculate history, but many species have disappeared. For creationists, of course, discrepancies and disappearances constitute further evidence brought in support of the principle of universal entropy which in turn indicates the need for special creation primitive. All these theories and arguments aimed at removing God from the world created by Him and even canceling his existence in the name of science or of so-called science. God is an obstacle for those who try to explain things in terms of being epistimiologic they just stop wanting to explain their ways. Thus, for them, if nature is all that exists, then it must be able to commit their own creation. This implies the existence of a natural evolutionary process able to form very complex things from simple ones.

Impression that the rejection of religious belief and atheism could be based on the achievements of Darwinian science is as widespread as it is misleading. I could get the impression that the science of Darwinian evolution to atheism through a simple linear approach is based on scientific research findings confuse themselves with philosophical extrapolation, those extrapolations that can be as well accepted or rejected by the people informed and good faith precisely because it goes beyond what can be confirmed or disproved by reference to facts.

### **VI.3. THE SYTHETIC THEORY OF EVOLUTION AND NEW-DARWINISM FROM ORTHODOX PERSPECTIVE**

Research on the causes of hereditary variations and their means degreasing and isolation mechanisms have facilitated the evolutionary process in populations and their detransformation in races and species. Replacing the morphological species concept biological species with the radical changes in the study caused speciation process. This helped them to elucidate the convergent, and all branches of the biology. Succeeding to achieve a synthesis of the accumulation of a century of scientific research, Synthetic Theory of Evolution (TSE) has established, in a certain sense, mechanisms of evolutionary processes.

Criticism synthetic theory of evolution says that synthetic theory admits that the micromutations which cause gradual nature of evolution can explain both microevolution and macroevolution. This way of thinking can be meet by us. The micromutations stand up to the



processes based microevolution but not macroevolution as the emergence of new types of organization, such as birds or pulmoniivertebrelor wing can not occur by micromutații. Conform TSE primary material of evolution is the structural gene mutations. Gradual change occurs in the frequency of genes in populations over generations under permanent control of natural selection.

And today still maintains the tendency of scientists to explain their biological laws by reducing the mechanical laws of physics or chemistry. He does not understand today that the vital and that its has its own laws of physics and chemistry over which they have their significance in the development of life processes, biological laws govern, own laws, which differ essentially inanimate animation, is to misunderstand the essence of vitality. Protestant theologian Charles Hodge says refusing any theory of the nature of the project to provide a place divine. He therefore accuses Darwinism and neo-Darwinism with atheism simply because it does not integrate project idea.

Neo-Darwinists have borrowed the desire to reconcile Christianity with scientific thinking represented by the New Age. This religious syncretism was conducted Theillard Jesuit priest and professor of Chardin. The dedicated purely naturalistic perspective that scientific theory in the first phase was transformed by neo-Darwinists in scientific truth. Current scientific results tend to be seized-ista new-age mentality that wants to demonstrate that it is possible the selfredemption. We propose a salvation that we do not need Christ, it is enough to know.

Fathers do not refer to a chaotic evolution that is strictly material causes, but refers to an emerging trend that the whole creation that the Creator evolving. From theologically and development of modern science presented as being able to explain the origin and development of the world is wrong, not just evolution.

## **VII. APOLOGETIC-MISSIONARY ASPECTS TOWARDS THE SECULAR ALTERNATIVES FOR THE UNIVERSE AND HUMA ORIGIN**

Life is defined as a "higher form of motion of matter" that appears at a certain stage of its development and at a synthesis of biological, physical, chemical, mechanical place. Life is so regarded only in terms of his physical plane, evading substrate material what defines the essence and meaning directly "I" bearer of the conscioussness. Orice "definition" of life is generally restricted, however much they would amplify future plans of study and as much privacy we enter the life processes.

Faunal communities were always others, while life was always the same. Life has not changed, however, its manifestations "work" her world was always different. But its meaning

was always upward. From simple organisms to some of the more complex, more complexity is a perfect energy and transforming it increasingly diverse in the sense amplifying its potential and the top of the spirit. This energy living means that appearance was an anti-entropic act of resistance as expressed by the second law of thermodynamics. It seems, however, that living systems can be reduced to the second law of thermodynamics, taking into account that they use both matter and energy.

But the laws of quantum physics, the scientific world believes unconditionally that we can not know what was beyond the "Planck time" and that the weight limit of the energy that is created. Therefore, some scientists, materialists now, could eventually say with Sir Arthur Eddington that "the world is Cloths Fabrics Spirit", so to accept that the uncreated energies or grace of the Holy Spirit, the Son or Word of God, the blessing Father did matter. Even if you went through stages known subparticulelor the process was instantaneous even in a higher degree than quantum physics postulates. Scientific honesty does not allow scientists to reject a priori something that I know nothing, so you have to tolerate and even this hypothesis.

Creation of theologically not necessarily imply a beginning metaphysical and the more natural one. Instead beginning metaphysics involves creation in the sense of internal connection between God and the world. But not involve beginning early metaphysical nature. It's a static universe, perfectly, without time limits or initial singularity. A similar picture is circulated and scientific creationism creationist. Beginning of creation does not necessarily natural (we have a physical or geometric singularity), or metaphysical beginning because it describes the appearance of nothingness of matter. So be cautious when making a connection between theological creation big bang.

Evolutionary theories and research were and are anchored in the material and visible world riddles and not divinity research. But researching material for nuclear physics and biochemistry aimed deciphering living element reached a limit beyond which appear aceleși metaphysical questions and almost explicitly states God's presence. It should be noted that Genesis is viewed differently by Eastern and Western theology. West be determined exclusively divine world and the cosmos, which seems vague and somewhat inconsistent. The transcendence of God became His absence in the world, is just one arbitrary divine intervention.

## **VII.1. MISSIONARY ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SECULAR ALTERNATIVES REGARDING THE ACT OF CREATION**

### **VII.1.1. ATTITUDE TOWARDS EVOLUTIONISM AND CREATIONISM**

Statement which shows that beginning mystery can not be contained because the world of work by some laws inconspicuous beginning of discursive logic, major harm pride scientists are sure of the infallibility of their methods of explaining the cause and purpose of the world. From this point of view, evolutionism remains a theory without significance, which

might give up easily if they would find an alternative theory that would provide an explanation for the emergence of an autonomous world. But it takes so much to this theory, with all its deficiencies, precisely because it is the clearest expression in the scientific to those who want to understand the world without God.

Creationism and evolutionary analysis that demonstrates that they are two ideologies that undermine the two fields of knowledge: the theological and the scientific. The creation of theology is part of the supernatural revelation and scientific research of God's creation is part of natural revelation. Theology is not talking about evolution, but the call to perfection and salvation of man and all creatures recapitulated in humans from God and development in history what God planted in response to the divine call.

If you're already able to recognize the existence of at least two levels of reality, the micro and macro cosmic necessary to go a step further, seeking to match: which requires the recognition of a new level, integrating the sacred.

## **VII.2. NON-DARWINISM OR THE CHANGE OF PARADIGM IN THE CONTEMPORARY BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH**

### **VII.2.1. THE RAPPORT BETWEEN NON-DARWINISM WITH IDEOLOGICAL NATURALISM**

Paradigm is a world view that synthesizes traditional elements coming from areas diverse. Paradigma said that all great discoveries made from the Renaissance until the early twentieth century have confirmed such a way that brilliant intuition that events that occur in our physical world can be explained based on the reasons themselves from the physical world. Thus God intervenes in the world, and in the seventeenth century, rediscovered it on Democritus and surpassing thanks ongoing avalanche of science, philosophy says that God was an unnecessary hypothesis.

Time and space are not absolute and can have a home. This makes the idea of a big bang, a beginning of time and space, can be deduced logically from relativity. In the '70s, big bang theory will give rise to a field of study even more challenging to traditional concepts, principle antropic. Cu modern ICT tools is now possible to model the evolution of the universe and the impact of other variables or on this development. We must consider that in almost all cases, universes, with different characteristics from ours, can not develop in a manner that allows the emergence of life and consciousness.

Great physicists of today's contemporary world said they can not do physics without metaphysics. We return to the perspective of Aristotelian physics that was anchored in metafizica. Dimpotrivă, he expects science to show the world that we are not ontologically enough - he is not self-sufficient, that there are other levels of reality, that time and space does not are absolute and that, therefore, an "exit" outside of time and space is possible. As also, the problem arises in the very heart of the creator of science and not just philosophers left.

### **VII.3. MISSIONARY SOLUTIONS FOR FIGHTING AGAINST TEACHING EVOLUTIONISM IN THE ROMANIAN EDUCATION**

Charles Darwin launched a theory attempting to explain the origin of species of plants and animals other than by creation. According to this theory the species would evolve naturally from each other, from simpler forms to more complex, and thus all life arose exist today, including humans, which is said to come from a species of monkey . This theory has never been proven, but some political parties are interested especially moral aspect of the problem (if man is descended from monkeys then we are free to act like animals), took the idea and were able to impose that theory official. Thus it was that in all schools in countries governed by such parties, to learn that man is descended from monkeys. Many thought so, because it taught in school, but when they began to study seriously the problem, they found ample evidence disprove evolutionary theory. Finally had to accept that man can not pull the monkey, there is a God who created the world and so that materialistic theories that have hitherto believed were false.

Such evolutionism is taught in textbooks with errors raționament. Majoritatea many textbooks of biology, zoology or anatomy not even a mention of God and His creation, turning everything on its own. Minds of children and students accept the theory of evolution, although adjacent theories, as the truth knowing that many of the theories learned are much invalid, inconsistent or false. Their mind oscillates between monkey and the image of God and is due for all of us to reinstate its rights presenting the truth in all theories with arguments and counterarguments. Man is not a descendant of an undeveloped beings since the beginning of the world, but God's image aiming likeness as Revelation tells us.

## VIII. CONCLUSIONS

From the above so far, we see that evolution is far from being a truly scientific theory, is actually a collection of false and unsubstantiated assumptions. In addition, there are many issues on which even evolutionists can not agree among them, a theory is contradicted by the author of another. Basically, most biologists are aware of the shortcomings of evolution, or at least some of them, the only reason you are still maintained his followers refused to accept the existence of God.

But science has shown not only never lack the divine, but also many great scientists of all ages and in all fields, such as Pascal, Newton, W.Thomson (Lord Kelvin), Cauchy, N.Bohr, Schrodinger, Laplace , Maxwell, Marconi, Descartes, Euler, Lavoisier, Berzelius, Pasteur, Faraday and many others, have professed faith in God.

In any case, from the above date, it is noted that the existence of God is not anti-scientific, as some contend, but it is very reasonable. Once accepted this idea, the most rational approach is that the origin of the world and of life, we accept that God himself told us the path of Revelation and reject other theories, especially if they contradict the data from experience.

## **BIBLIOGRAFIE**

### **I. Ediții ale Sfintei Scripturi**

1. Biblia. Ediție a Sfântului Sinod, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 2008
2. Noul Testament, versiune revizuită de I.P.S. Bartolomeu, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune, 1995.

### **II. Lucrări patristice**

1. Avva Dorotei, Învățăături și scrisori de suflet folositoare, Ed. Bunavestire, Bacău, 1997.
2. Marcu Ascetul, Răspuns acelor care se îndoiesc despre dumnezeiescul Botez, în Filocalia I, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2004.
3. Cuviosul Ioan de la Valaam, Fericirile, Ed. Anastasia, 1997.
4. Origen, How Does God Function în Human Life?, în Christianity and Crises, XXVII, nr. 8, 15 mai 1967
5. Idem, Love Unbounded în The Perkins School of Theology Journal, XIX, 3, Spring 1966
6. Idem, Theology and Philosophy: A New Phase în the Discussion, în Journal of Religion, XLIV, 1 Ianuarie 1967
7. Sfântul Grigore de Nyssa, Despre Fericiri, în PSB vol 29, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al BOR, București, 1983
8. Sfântul Ignatie Briancianinov, Cuvânt despre om, Editura Bunavestire, Bacău, 2001
9. Idem, *Experiențe Ascetice*, volumul I, Editura Sophia, București, 2000.
10. Sfântul Ioan din Cronstadt, Viața mea în Hristos, 1995.
11. Sfântul Ioan Damaschin, Dogmatica, Ed. Scripta, București, 1993.
12. Sfântul Ioan Gură de Aur, Despre preoție, cartea a șasea cap. IV, traducere de Pr. D. Fecioru în B.O.R. nr. 10/1957.

13. Idem, Omilii la Facere, I, PSB 21, partea întâi, EIBMBOR, București, 1987.
14. Sfântul Grigorie Nazianz, Cele cinci cuvântări teologice, 1993.
15. Sfantul. Grigorie Nyssa., Marele cuvânt Catehetic, 1998.
16. Idem, "Scrieri "PSB 30,EIBMBOR, Bucuresti, 1998.
17. Sfântul Nicolae Cabasila,Tâlcuirea dumnezeieștii Liturghiei,EIBMBOR, București, 1997.
18. Sfântul Maxim Mărturisitorul, Ambigua, în col. PSB, nr. 80, EIBMBOR, București, 2006.
19. Idem, Capete despre dragoste, în Filocalia, vol.2, Ed. Harisma, București, 1993.
20. Sfântul Simeon Noul Teolog, Discursuri teologice și etice, Scrieri I, II,Ed.Deisis, Sibiu, 1998.
21. Idem, Cateheze, Ed.Deisis, Sibiu, 1999.
22. Idem, Imne, trad.și note Pr.Prof.Dr.Dumitru Stăniloae, în vol. Studii de teologie dogmatică ortodoxă, Ed.Mitropoliei Olteniei, Craiova, 1990.
23. Sfântul Simeon al Tesalonicului, Cuvânt despre preoție, la Pr.prof.dr.Spiridon Cădea, „Chipul preotului după Sfânta Scriptură și Sfinții Părinți” în Mitropolia Ardealului, nr.1-3/1961
24. Sf. Vasile cel Mare, Scrieri, partea I, PSB 17,EIBMBOR,București, 1986.
25. Idem, **Omilii la Hexaimeron**, Ed. Sophia, Bucuresti, 2004.
26. Sfântul Teofan Zăvorâtul, Ce este viața duhovnicească, 1997.
27. Thoma d'Aquino,Opere,Summa theologiae, Editura Științifică, București, 1997.

### III. Dicționare, lexicoane și enciclopedii

1. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and Philologically arranged with special referenec to Cognate Indo-European Languages, by Sir Monier Monier-Williams. New edition greatly enlarged and improved with collaboration of Prof. E. Lfumann and Prof. C. Cappeller, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. Private limited, New Delhi, 1997
2. Bellhouse, E., Vita Florum, în: The Visual Encyclopedia of Unconventional Medicine, editor Ann Hill, New York, Crown Publishers Inc., 1979
3. Collier's Encyclopedia, 1994, 2:138, 1994
4. Dicționarului explicativ al limbii române, ediția a doua, Academia Română, Ed.Univers Enciclopedic, București, 1998.
5. Enciclopedia Universală Britannica - Volumul 3, Ed.Litera, București, 2012.
6. Encyclopaedia Universalis, CD-ROM versiunea 5.1.2.

7. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1:789, 1992.
8. Marcu, Florin, Marele dicționar de neologisme,, Editura Saeculum, 2000.
9. Marcu, Florin și Maneca, Constantin, Dicționar de neologisme,, Editura Academiei, București, 1986.
10. Mohan, Gheorghe, Ardelean, Aurel, Enciclopedie de biologie, Ed.All, Bucuresti, 2007.
11. Săhleanu, Victor, Stugren, Bogdan, „Mică enciclopedie de biologie și medicină”, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1976.
12. World Book Encyclopedia, 6:409–410, 1994

#### **IV. Cărți, lucrări și articole publicate în România și străinătate**

1. Ayala, Francisco J „Teleological Explanations în Evolutionary Biolog/”(„Explicații teologice în biologia evoluționistă”), în Philosophy of Science, 37 (martie 1970)
2. Idem, Darul lui Darwin catre știință și religie, ed. Curtea veche, Bucuresti, 2008.
3. Alexander, Denis, Creație sau evoluție. Trebuie să alegem?, Ed. Curtea veche, București, 2010.
4. Idem, Models for Relating Science and Religion, în The Faraday Papers, Aprilie, 2007.
5. Arnould, Jacque, La theologie apres Darwin, Ed. Cerf, Paris, 1996.
6. Idem, Les Creationistes, Ed. Cerf, Paris, 1996.
7. Arseniev, Nicolae, Sensul și ținta istoriei, trad. prof. dr. Remus Rus, ST, 5-6, 1989.
8. Atkins, Peter, Amprenta lui Galileo, Ed. All, București, 2008.
9. Balca, Prof. Dr. Nicolae, Istoria filosofiei antice, EIBMBOR, București, 1982.
10. Idem, Concepția despre lume și viață în teologia Fericitului Augustin, ST, 3-4, 1962.
11. Barbour, Ian G., Religion în Age of Science, New York, Harper and Row, 1990.
12. Idem, Când știința întâlnește religia. Adversare, străine sau partenere?, Ed, Curtea veche, București, 2006.
13. Idem, Religion and Science . Historical and Contemporary Issues , Harper , San Francisco, 1997.
14. Barrow, John, Originea universului, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1994.
15. Bălăceanu Stolnici, Acad. Constantin, Religie și Știință, complementaritate nu antagonism, în Știință și religie – antagonism și complementaritate, Ed. Eonul Dogmatic, București, 2002.
16. Idem, Cunoaștere și știință, Ed. Fundației Andrei Șaguna, Constanța, 1999.



17. Bălăceanu Stolnici, Acad. Constantin, Berescu, Magdalena, Gândirea magică. Geneză și evoluție, Ed. Nemira, București, 2009.
18. Becquemont, Daniel, Darwin, darwinisme, evolutionisme, Ed. Kime, Paris, 1992.
19. Behe, Michael, Darwins Black Box, Free Press, New York, 1996.
20. Bel, Pr. Prof. Dr. Valer, Misiunea Bisericii în lumea contemporană, Presa Universitara Clujeana, Cluj-Napoca, 2002
21. Idem, Comunitatea mărturisitoare în contextul lumii secularizate și globalizate, în Simpozionul „Modernism, postmodernism și religie”. Constanța mai 2005, Editura Vasiliana '98, Iași, 2005
22. Benga, Pr. Daniel, Metodologia cercetării științifice în teologia istorică, Ed. Sophia, București, 2005.
23. Berdiaev, Nikolai, Sensul creștii, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1992.
24. Idem, Sensul istoriei, Iași, 1996.
25. Bergeron, Richard, Le cortège des fous de Dieu. Un chretien scrute les nouvelles religions, Editions Paulines, Apostolat des Editions, Montreal, Paris, 1990.
26. Bergson, Henri, Creative Evolution și Two Sources of Morality and Religion, The Modern Library, Manufactured în United States of America, 1944.
27. Bohm, David, Plenitudinea lumii și ordinea ei, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1995.
28. Bosch, David, Dynamique de la mission chretienne, Editions Karthala, Haho et Labor et Fides, 1995
29. Botnariuc, N, "Evolutionismul în impas?", Bucuresti, 1992.
30. Idem, Biologie generală, Ed. Didactică și pedagogică, București, 1979.
31. Boutroux, Em., L'idée de loi dans la science et la philosophie contemporaines, Paris, Vrin, 1925.
32. Brandusoiu, Maria, Androne, Constanta, Biologie VI, Ed. Didactica și Pedagogica, 1998.
33. Idem, Cuvinte pentru cei care vor să se mântuiască, Editura Sophia, București, 2000.
34. Buican, Denis, Evoluția și evoluționismul, Ed CD Press, București, 2006.
35. Buta, Mircea Gelu, Moștenirea lui Darwin, în „Tabor”, nr.8, noiembrie 2009.
36. Calvin, Melvin, Chemical evolution, în “Evolutionary Biology”, vol. I, New York, 1967.
37. Caullery, M., La science francaise depuis le XVII-e siècle, Paris, Arm. Colin, 1933.
38. Cârlan, Marius, Elemente de genetică animală normală, 1996.
39. Ceașescu I., Mohan Gh.; Din viața și opera marilor biologi, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1977.

40. Cherfas, Jeremy „The Difficulties of Darwinism" („Problemele darwinismului") în *New Scientist*, 102 (17 mai, 1984).
41. Chirila, Dr. Pavel, Valica, Pr. Mihai, *Meditatii la medicina biblica*.
42. Ciobotea, IPS Prof.Univ.Dr. Daniel, *Necesitatea dialogului dintre știință și credință azi*, în *Știință și religie – antagonism și complementaritate*, Ed. Eonul Dogmatic, București, 2002.
43. Clement, Olivier, *Creștinătate, secularizare și Europa*, în Ioan I. Ică jr.; Germano Marani, „Gândirea Socială a Bisericii. Fundamente – documente – analiza – perspective”, Editura Deisis, Sibiu, 2002.
44. Cobb, John, *Christian Natural Theology*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, London, 2007.
45. Colectiv, *Cosmogony and ethical order*, The University of Chicago Press, 1982.
46. Collins, Francis, *Limbajul lui Dumnezeu*, Ed. Curtea veche, Bucuresti, 2009.
47. Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition, 2009.
48. Comte, Fernand, "Dictionar de creștinism", trad. Elena Bitu și Lucian Nicolae, Ed. Niculescu, 1999.
49. Constantinescu, Radu, Calina, Gelu, (coordonatori), *Teologie și științe naturale*, Ed. Mitropolia Olteniei, Craiova, 2002.
50. Cosmovici, Andrei, *Psihologie Generală*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 1996.
51. Costache, Pr. Dr. Doru, *Istoria recentă, actualitatea și perspectivele reporturilor între teologie și reprezentarea științifică a lumii*, în *Știință și Teologie*, Ed. Eonul dogmatic, Bucuresti, 2001.
52. Idem, *Logos și Creație*, Teză de doctorat, București, 2000.
53. Idem, *Logos, evoluție și finalitate. Spre o soluție transdisciplinară*, în vol. „Sfintii Părinți despre originile și destinul cosmosului și omului”, Ed. Deisis, Sibiu, 2003.
54. Idem, *Viziunea teologiei ortodoxe asupra controverselor creaționism – evoluționism*, în vol. *Teologie și Științe naturale*, Ed. Mitropolia Olteniei, Craiova, 2002.
55. Idem, *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin sau încercarea unei perspective integrale*, în vol. *Știință și Teologie*, Ed. Eonul dogmatic, București, 2001.
56. Idem, *Crearea lumii văzute*, *Ortodoxia*, 1-2, 1997.
57. Craciun, T., Tomozei, I., Coles, N., Butnaru, Galia, *Genetica vegetală*, 1991.
58. Darwin, C., *Originea speciilor*, Ed. Independentă, București, 2007.
59. Idem, *Amintiri despre dezvoltarea gândirii și caracterului meu*, Ed. Academiei RSR, Bucuresti, 1962.
60. Idem, *The descendance of man*, 1871.

61. Idem, Călătoria unui naturalist în jurul lumii la bordul vasului Beagle, Ed. Tineretului, București, 1958.
62. Davies, Paul, Ultimele trei minute, ipoteze privind soarta finală a universului, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1994.
63. Dawkins, Richard, Un râu pornit din Eden, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1995.
64. Dembski, W. A., Ruse, M., ed., Debating Design: From Darwin to DNA (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
65. Dembski, W.A., „What every theologian should know about creation, evolution and design”, Transactions 3.
66. Denton, Michael, Evolution: A Theory în Crisis, London, Burnett Books, Ltd., 1985.
67. Dericquebourg, Regis, Religion de guerison, Ed. Cerf, Paris, 1988.
68. Desmond, Adrian, Moore și James, Darwin, New York, London, W.W.Norton, 1994.
69. Dorobanțu, Mircea, Curs de Chimie organică, an II, curs III, UBB Cluj.
70. Durkheim, Emile, Formele elementare ale vieții religioase, Editura Polirom, Iași 1995.
71. Dumitrescu, Constantin, Segal, Brad, Segal, Rodica, Citoprotecția și alimentația, 1991.
72. Dumm, John, Locke. O scurtă introducere, Ed. All, București, 2009.
73. Einstein, Albert, Cum văd eu lumea, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2000.
74. Elemente de radiobiologie vegetală, coordonator Corneanu Gabriel, 1989.
75. Eliade, Mircea, Istoria credințelor și ideilor religioase, Ed. Univers Enciclopedic, București, 2000
76. Idem, Tratat de istorie a religiilor, Editura Humanitas, București, 1992.
77. Engels, F., Dialectica naturii, ESPLP, 1954.
78. Eseu asupra intelectului omenesc, traducere Armand Roșu și Teodor Voiculescu București, Editura Științifică, 1961.
79. Evolution" („îndoieli cu privire la teoria evoluției moderne și sintetice”), în American Biology Thecher, (septembrie 1971).
80. Federer, William, Dumnezeu și țara Americii, 1996.
81. Felea, Ilarion, Religia culturii, Ed. Episcopiei Ortodoxe Arad, 1994.
82. Felmy, Christian, Dogmatica experienței eclesiale, Ed. Deisis, Sibiu, 1999.
83. Flonta, Mircea, Darwin și după Darwin, Studii de filozofie a biologiei, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2010.
84. Funkenstein, Amos, Teologie și imaginație științifică, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1998.
85. Florescu, Mihail, Enigmele și paradigmele materiei, Ed. Politică, București, 1984.
86. Gayon, Jean, Darwin et l’après Darwin: un histoire de l’hypothese de selection naturelle, Ed. Kime, Paris, 1992.

87. Geisler, Norman, Apologetică creștină, Ed. Societatea Misionară Română, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1994.
88. Geisser, L., Filosofia religiei, Ed. Cartea Creștină, Oradea, 1999.
89. Graunt, John, Natural and Political Observations Mentioned în a Following Index, and Made Upon the Bills of Mortality, în D. Smith, N. Keyfitz, "Mathematical Demography", Selected Papers, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
90. Gregersen, Niels Henrik, Dumnezeu într-o lume evoluționistă, Editura Curtea veche, București, 2007
91. Guitton, Jean, Dumnezeu și Stiința, Trad.pr.Ioan Buga, Ed.Harisma, București, 1992.
92. Hall, Norman K, . Hall, Lucia K.B, "Is the War Between Science and Religion Over?" The Humanist, Vol. 46, Mai/Iunie 1986.
93. Hartshorne, Charles, Man's Vision of God and the logic of teism, Willett, Clark & Co., Chicago, 1941.
94. Haught, John, știință și religie – de la conflict la dialog, Ed Eonul dogmatic, Bucuresti, 2002.
95. Hawking, Stephen, Scurtă istorie a timpului, Ed.Humanitas, București, 1992.
96. Idem, Universul într-o coajă de nucă, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2007.
97. Heidegger, Martin, Conceptul de timp, Ed.Humanitas, București, 2000.
98. Hellemans, Alexander, Bunch, Bryan, Istoria descoperirilor științifice, Ed. Orizonturi, București, 1988.
99. Hick, John, Noua frontieră a religiei și științei, ed. Herald, București, 2010.
100. Huxley, Julian, Evolution în Action (Evoluția în acțiune) (New York:HarperBros., 1953).
101. Ică, Pr.Prof.Dr.Ioan, Dr.Kalomiros despre facerea lumii, iad și slava materiei și terapia discursului religios și pedagogic al Bisericii, în Alexandros Kalomiros, Sfinții Părinți despre originea și destinul cosmosului și al omului, Ed.Deisis, Sibiu, 1998.
102. Idem, Comuniune și intecomuniune, GB,5-6, 1978.
103. Ică, Diac.Prof.Dr.Ioan jr., Sfântul Simeon Noul Teolog și provocarea mistică în teologia bizantină și contemporană, în Sfântul Simoen Noul Teolog, Discursuri teologice și etice, Ed.Deisis, Sibiu, 1998.
104. Idem, Catehezele simeoniene : problematica filosofică și istorică, în Sfântul Simeon Noul Teolog, Cateheze, Ed.Deisis, Sibiu, 1999.
105. Iftime, Oana, Iftime, Alexandru, Evolutionismul și Ortodoxia, Ed. Egumenita, 2009
106. Iftime, Oana, Introducere în antievolutionismul stiintific, Ed. Anastasia, 2003.

107. Idem, Teoria materialistă asupra originii vieții, în vol. Teologie și științe naturale, Ed. Mitropoliei Olteniei, Craiova, 2002.
108. Ilie, Arhim. Cleopa, Minunile lui Dumnezeu din zidiri, 1996.
109. Ionescu, Răzvan Andrei, Despre model în fizică și în teologia ortodoxă. Repere pentru un posibil dialog contemporan între știință și teologie, în „Perspective românești asupra științei și teologiei”, Ed. Curtea Veche, București, 2006.
110. Irineu, PS Bistrițeanul, Sfântul Irineu de Lyon, Ed.Cartimpex, Cluj Napoca, 1998.
111. Isac, Dumitru, Studii, prelegeri și note de curs de istoria filozofiei moderne, Editura Argonaut, Cluj Napoca, 2007.
112. Istodor, Pr.lect.dr. Gheorghe, Misiunea creștină ca activitate permanentă și practica a Bisericii, Ed Sigma, București, 2006.
113. Idem, Dialogul dintre teologie și știință din perspectiva misiunii Bisericii, Ed. Do-Minor, București, 2010
114. Idem, Raportul dintre teologie și știință în modernitate și post-modernitate, în vol. ”Simpozionul știință și religie. Conflict sau convergență?”, Ed. Vasiliana’98, Iași, 2005.
115. Idem, Postmodernismul – provocare majoră pentru misiunea Bisericii creștine, în Simpozionul modernism, postmodernism și religie. Constanța. Mai 2005, Editura Vasiliana ’98, Iași, 2005.
116. Idem, Introducere în Misiologia Ortodoxă, Editura Do Minor, București, 2009
117. Yahya, Harun, Evoluționismul, teoria darwinismului demontată de știința modernă, Ed. Deceneu, București, 2011.
118. IPS. Mitr. de Aragos și Ciprian, Filis, Sindromul epocii noi și nădejdea Ortodoxiei noastre, Ed. Sf. Manastire ciprian, 1990.
119. Itu, Mircea, Filosofia și Istoria Religiiilor, București, Editura Fundației România de Măine, 2004
120. Jacob, F., Logica viului, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1972.
121. Johnson, Phillip E., Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds, Inter Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1997.
122. Kalomirov, dr. Alexandros, Sfintii Parinti despre originile și destinul cosmosului și omului, Ed. Deisis, Sibiu, 2003.
123. Kant, I., Întemeierea metafizicii moravurilor. Critica rațiunii practice, Ed. Științifică, București, 1972.
124. Idem, Religia doar în limitele rațiunii, Ed. All, București, 2007.
125. Kitcher, Phillip, The advancement of science, Oxford University Press, 1993.

126. Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District, 04 cv 2688 (December 20, 2005).
127. Koetsler, Arthur, Lunaticii. Evoluția conceptelor despre Univers de la Pitagora la Newton, Ed.Humanitas, București, 1997.
128. Kothe, Dr. Rainer, Întrebări și răspunsuri, pământul și spațiul cosmic, Ed. Enciclopedică, RAO, București, 2004.
129. Kovalevsky, Jean, Taina originilor, Ed. Anastasia, București, 1996.
130. Kuraev, Diac. Andrei Ortodoxie și creationism, în vol. „, Sfintii Parinti despre originile și destinul cosmosului și omului „, Ed.Deisis, Sibiu, 2003.
131. Laertios, Diogenes, Despre viețile și doctrinele filosofilor, Ed. Minerva, 1997.
132. Landrieu, M., Lamarck, le fondateur du transformisme, 1909.
133. Leakey, Richard, Originea omului, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1995.
134. Lecourt, Dominique, Dicționar de istoria și filosofia științelor, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2005.
135. Lemeni, Adrian, Sensul eshatologic al creației, Ed.ASAB, Bucuresti, 2004.
136. Lemeni, As.Dr. Adrian, Ideologizarea științei, în Știință și teologie, Ed.Eonul dogmatic, București, 2001.
137. Lemeni, Adrian, Ionescu, Pr.Razvan, Dictionar de teologie ortodoxa și știință , Ed.Curtea veche, Bucuresti, 2009.
138. Idem, Teologie orodoxă și știință, EIBMBOR, București, 2006.
139. Lemeni, Adrian( Coordonator), Repere patristice în dialogul dintre teologie și știință , Ed.Basilica, Bucuresti, 2009.
140. Lenin, V.I., Opere, vol. 14, Ed.Politică, 1959.
141. Leon, Nicolae, Amintiri,în Viața Românească SA, Iași, 1925.
142. Lepeltier, Thomas, Darwin eretic, Ed Rosetti, Bucuresti, 2009.
143. Lewontin, R.C., - The units of selection. Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 1, 1-11, Palo - Alto, California, 1970.
144. “ Le darwinisme en question. Science ou metaphysique ? “, Paris, Edition Pierre d’Angle, 1996.
145. Liturghier, EIBMBOR, București, 2000.
146. Lloyd, Richard, Metode și probleme în știința Greciei, Ed.Teora, București, 1994.
147. Lonchamp, Jean-Pierre, știință și credință, Ed.Eonul dogmatic, Bucuresti, 2003.
148. Idem, *Afacerea Galilei*, XXI Eonul dogmatic, București, 2004.
149. Lossky, Vladimir, Vederea lui Dumnezeu, Ed. Deisis, Sibiu, 1995.
150. Idem, Teologia mistică a Bisericii de Răsărit, Ed. Anastasia, București, 1990.
151. Maldame, Jean Michel, Evolution et creation, Revue Thomiste, nr.4,1996.

152. Malthus, T.R., Eseu asupra principiului populației, Ed. Științifică, București, 1992.
153. Marin, Andrei, Ion Popescu, Florica Marascu, Maria Soigan, Biologie IX, Ed. Didactica și Pedagogica, 1996.
154. Martin, C. P."A Non-Geneticist Looks at Evolution" („Opiniile unui negenetician cu privire la evoluție”), în American Scientist, (ianuarie 1953).
155. Mayr, Ernst, in Populations, Species and Evolution (Populații, specii și evoluție).(Cambridge, Mass:Harvard University Press, 1970).
156. Idem, „De la bacterie la om.Evolutia lumii vii”, Ed.Humanitas, București, 2008.
157. Idem, Darwin et la pensee modern de l’evolution,Ed. Odile,Paris, 1993.
158. Mayr, Ernst ,The Growth of Biological Thought. Cambridge: Harvard, 1981.
159. Masi, Roberto,,The Credo of Paul VI: Theology of Original Sin and the Scientific Theory of Evolution” L'Osservatore Romano, 17 aprilie 1969, ediția engleză.
160. Marx,K., Engels, F., Opere, vol.II., ESPLP, 1958.
161. Mester, L., Zoologia vertebratelor. Amphibia, 1987.
162. Mihăiescu, H., Papu,Edgar, (traducători), Epicur, Lucrețiu, București, Editura de Stat, 1950.
163. Mihăiță, Prof. Dr. Nifon, Arhiepiscopul Târgoviștei, Misiologie creștină, București, 2005
164. Mihălcescu, Pr. Prof. Ioan, Curs de Teologie Fundamentală, partea I, București, 1925
165. Idem, Apologetica - Noțiuni de filosofie a Religiei, Editura Episcopiei Romanului și Hușilor, 1994.
166. Miller, K.R, “ The Flagellum Unspun”, Debating Design.
167. Idem,Finding Darwin’s God, New York, Harper Collins, 1999.
168. Mircea, Alexandru, Ovidiu Bojor, Fructele și legumele - factori de terapie naturala, 1983.
169. Mironescu, Alexandru, Limitele cunoasterii stiintifice, Ed.Harisma, Bucuresti, 1994.
170. Idem, Certitudine și adevăr, Ed. Harisma, București, 1992.
171. Mohan, Gh., Neacsu, P.,Teorii, legi, ipoteze și concepții în biologie, 1992.
172. Mohan, Gheorghe, Ardelean, Aurel, Mihail, Aurora Biologie V, Ed. ALL 1997.
173. Moldoveanu, D., Hitler, un catolic de conjunctura în Lumea nr. 10/2006.
174. Moltmann, Jurgen, God în creation. An ecological doctrine of creation, SCM Press, 1985.
175. Idem, L’Esprit qui donne la vie, Ed. Cerf,Paris, 1999.
176. Morris,. H. M., "Creationismul stiintific", Bucuresti, 1992.

177. Idem, The Long War Against God, Baker Book House, Michigan, 1989.
178. Idem, Bazele biblice ale științei moderne, Illinois, USA, 1993 .
179. Morris, Henry M, Parker, Gary E.,Introducere în știință creationista, Ed. Anastasia, Bucuresti, 2000.
180. Motas, C.,Charles Darwin. Viata și opera, Editura Stiintifică,Bucuresti, 1972.
181. Muller, H. J „Radiation Damage to the Genetic Material" („Daune produse de radiații materialului genetic"),in American Scientist,38( ianuarie 1950).
182. Mustata, Gheorghe, Mustata, Mariana,Origine, evoluție și Evolutionism, “ Vasile Goldis” University Press, Arad, 2001.
183. Myers, Norman „The End of the Lines" („Capătul rândurilor") în Natural History,94 (februarie 1985).
184. Nastasescu, Gh, Partin, Zoe,Biologie X, Ed. Didactica și Pedagogica, 1997.
185. Nellas, Panayotis, Omul- animal îndumnezeit, Trad.Diac.Prof.Dr.Ioan Ică Jr.,Ed.Deisis, Sibiu, 1999.
186. Nicolescu, Basarab, Stavinschi, Magda, știință și Religie antagonism sau complementaritate,Ed. Eonul dogmatic, Bucuresti, 2002.
187. Nicolescu, Acad.Prof.Dr. Basarab,Originea creștină a științei moderne, în Noua reprezentare a lumii, nr. 3,Ed.Eonul dogmatic, București, 2004.
188. Idem, Transdisciplinaritatea. Manifest, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 1999.
189. Niculcea, Pr. Prof. Dr. Adrian, Hristologiile eretice, Editura Arhetip, București, 2002
190. Idem, Cunoașterea naturală a lui Dumnezeu de la autorii biblici la gânditorii moderni, Ed. Garuda –Art, Vasiliana '98, Chișinău – Iași, 2006
191. Olteanu, Radu, Dilemele antropogenezei, Ed.Academiei Române, București, 2010.
192. Omelianovski, M.E., Problemele filosofice ale mecanicii cuantice, Ed. Științifică, București, 1958.
193. Opris, Tudor, Mica enciclopedie pentru tineret, cartea 2, varietatea lumii vii, 1994.
194. Idem, Zoologia, 1997.
195. Papadopol,D., Istoria filosofiei moderne, vol.3, Societatea romana de filosofie, Bucuresti, 1938.
196. Parvulescu, Protosinghel Ioachim,Cele trei mari mistere vizibile și incontestabile din Biserica Ortodoxa.
197. Paulescu, Nicolae, "Notiunile de Suflet și Dumnezeu în fiziologie",Ed. Anastasia, Bucuresti, 1999.
198. Idem, Fiziologie filozofica I.



199. Idem, Răspuns d-lui Dr. N. Leon, în „Convorbiri Literare”, martie și mai 1904.
200. Pârvu, Ilie, Arhitectura existenței, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1990.
201. Petcu, Pr. Lucian Răzvan, Cosmologia creștină și teoriile fizicii moderne, Ed. Sophia, București, 2008.
202. Petraru, Pr. Conf. Dr. Gheorghe, Știința în căutarea unui Logos. Căi de dialog religie - Știință, în vol. „Simpozionul știință și religie. Conflict sau convergență?”, Ed. Vasiliana 98, Iași, 2005.
203. Plank, Max, Scienze Filozofia Religione, Ed. Fabri, Milano, 1973.
204. Ponty, Jacques Merleaux, Cosmologia secolului XX, Ed. Științifică, București, 1978.
205. Popescu, Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru, Ortodoxie și contemporaneitate, Ed. Diogene, București, 1996.
206. Idem, "Cosmologia autonoma și cosmologia teonoma. Un aspect al teologiei romanesti", în vol. Știință și Teologie, Ed. Eonul dogmatic, București, 2001.
207. Idem, Teologie și cultură, EIBMBOR, București, 1993.
208. Idem, Omul fără rădăcini, Editura Nemira, București, 2001.
209. Idem, Raționalitatea creației și implicațiile ei, în Ortodoxia, nr.3-4, 1993.
210. Popescu, Dumitru, Costache, Doru, Introducere în Dogmatica Ortodoxa, ed. Libra, București, 1997.
211. Idem, Hristos. Biserică. Societate, EIBMBOR, București, 1998.
212. Postmodernismul. Deschideri filozofice, Ed. Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1995.
213. Prigogine, Ilya, Între eternitate și timp, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1997.
214. Puhalo, Lazăr, Dovada lucrurilor nevăzute. Ortodoxia și fizica modernă, Ed. Eonul dogmatic, București, 2005.
215. Radu, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Dumitru, Repere morale pentru omul contemporan, Editura Mitropolia Olteniei, Craiova, 2007.
216. Raicu, P., "Genetica", București, 1992
217. Raicu, Petre, Coman, Nicolae, Stugren, Bogdan, Duma, Doina, Marascu, Florica, Biologie. Genetica și evolutionism, XII, Ed. Didactica și Pedagogica, 1997 Bălăceanu Stolnici, Acad. Constantin
218. Ratzinger, Cardinal, în the Beginning: A Catholic Understanding of the Story of Creation and the Fall, Eerdmans, 1995.
219. Idem, Creation and Evolution: A Conference With Pope Benedict XVI în Castel Gandolfo, S.D.S. Ed. Stephan Horn.

220. Răduleş, Remus, şi colab. *Lexiconul Tehnic Român*, Editura Tehnică, Bucureşti, 1957-1966.
221. Richet, Charles, *La selection Humaine*, Librairie Felix Alean, 1919.
222. Rose, Ieromonah Seraphim, *Cartea Facerii, Crearea Lumii şi Omul Inceputurilor*, Ed. Sophia, Bucuresti, 2001.
223. Idem, *Ortodoxia şi religia viitorului*, Editura Sophia, Bucureşti, 2005
224. Rus, Remus, *Concepţia despre om în marile religii*, în GB,nr.7-8, Bucureşti, 1978.
225. Idem, *Consideraţii asupra concepţiilor biblică şi mesopotamiană despre creaţie*, GB, 6-8, 1980.
226. Sagan, Carl, *The Dragons of Eden*, Book Club Associates, London, 1977.
227. Salisbury, Frank B., în „Doubts about the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution”(„îndoieli cu privire la teoria evoluţiei moderne şi sintetice”), în *American Biology Thecher*, (septembrie 1971).
228. Sandu, Prof.dr.ing.Gheorghe (Ieromonah Grigorie), *Pe Urme Antropologice*”, publicat în *Colecţia Isihasm*, Ed. Conphis, 1999.
229. Idem, *Evoluţia spre Creator*,Ed. Mitropolia Olteniei, Craiova, 2003.
230. Idem, “Mântuitoarea frică de Dumnezeu”,Editura Christiana, Bucuresti, 2008.
231. Savin,. I.Gh,*Apararea credintei*, 1996.
232. Idem, *Apologetica*, Vol I, Ed Anastasia, 2002.
233. Idem, *Apologetica*, Vol II, Ed Anastasia, 2002.
234. Idem, *Apararea credintei, Tratat de apologetica*, Ed.Anastasia, Bucuresti, 1996.
235. Schlossberg, Herbert, *Idols for destruction*, Thommas Nelson Publisher, Nashville, 1984.
236. Schrodinger, Erwin, "Ce este viata? şi Spirit şi materie", Ed. Politică, Bucuresti, 1980.
237. Schroeder, Gerald, *Genesis and Big Bang: The Discovery of Harmony between Norder Science and the Bible*, New York, Bantam Books, 1992.
238. Schutzenberger, M.P.,*Lacunele darwinismului*, Scara, Treapta a treia.
239. Sire, James, *Universul de lângă noi – un catalog al concepţiilor fundamentale despre lume şi viaţă*, Oradea, Cartea Creştină,2005.
240. Scott, Eugenie C. (2004). "Chapter 6: Neocreationism". *Evolution vs. Creationism: An Introduction*. University of California Press.
241. Simpozionul ştiinţă şi Religie, Conflict sau convergenta?, ed Vasiliana'98, Iasi, 2005.

242. Simpson, G.G., - The major fetures of evolution. Columbia Univ. Press, New York,1953
243. Simpson, George G „Uniformitarianism" („Conceptul de uniformitate"),Chap. 2 în Essays în Evolution and Genetics, Ed. by Max A. Hecht & Wm. C. Steeres (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1970).
244. Singer,Peter , Tratat de etică, Ed. Polirom, 2006.
245. Singh, Simon, Big Bang. Originea universului, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2008.
246. Shermer, Michael (13 august 2007), Why Darwin Matters: The Case Against Intelligent Design, New York: Henry Holt,
247. Sofronie, Arhimandrit, Nașterea într-o împărăția cea neclătită, Ed.Reîntregirea, Alba Iulia, 2003.
248. Idem, Mistica vederii lui Dumnezeu, Ed.Adonai, București, 1995.
249. Stan,Pr.Conf.Dr.Alexandru și Rus,Prof.Dr.Remus, Istoria religiilor, EIBMBOR, Bucuresti, 1991
250. Staniloae,pr.Prof.Dr. Dumitru,Teologia Dogmatica Ortodoxa, vol I-III, 1996
251. Idem, Chipul nemuritor al lui Dumnezeu, vol.I, Ed. Cristal, București, 1995.
252. Idem, Viața și învățătura Sfântului Grigorie Palama, Ed.Scripta, București, 1993.
253. Iddem, Poziția domnului Lucian Blaga fața de creștinism și ortodoxie, Editura Paideia, București, 1993
254. Idem, Sfânta Treime și creația lumii din nimic, MO,2, 1987.
255. Idem, Creația că dar și tainele Bisericii, Ortodoxia, nr. 1, 1976.
256. Idem, Dinamica creației în Biserică, Ortodoxia, nr.3-4, 1977.
257. Idem, Creația –darul lui Dumnezeu către noi, MMS, 3-6, 1970.
258. Stapp, Henry, Rațiune, materie și mecanică cuantică, Ed. Tehnică, București, 1998.
259. Staune, Jean, Știința și căutarea sensului. Întâlnirea dintre cunoașterea cea mai recentă și intuițiile milenare, în Știință și religie – antagonism și complementaritate, Ed. Eonul Dogmatic, București, 2002.
260. Idem, Science et quete de sens, Presses de la Renaissance, Paris, 2005.
261. Stein, G.,in American Scientist, ian/feb 1988.
262. Stenson, James B., „Evolution: a Catholic Perspective”, Catholic Position Papers, Series A, Number 116, March, 1984.
263. Stratan, Gheorghe, Max Planck despre relațiile dintre știință și religie, în „Știință și religie, antagonism sau complementaritate?”, Ed.Eonul dogmatic, București, 2002.
264. Străinescu, Dr.Ing. Ioan,Creoționismul științific, Apologetica, 2010.

265. Stringer, Chris, Andrew, Peter, Istoria completă a evoluției umane, Ed. Aquila, București, 2006.
266. Suster, Petru M, Tachinidele și problema selecției naturale, Revista V. Adamachi, vol. XIV, nr. 2, aprilie, 1928.
267. Taton, Rene, Istoria generală a științei ; știința antică și medievală, vol.I, Ed. Științifică, București, 1970.
268. Teilhard de Chardin, Fenomenul uman, Ed. Aios, Oradea
269. Idem, Scrisori inedite, Ed.Polirom, Iași, 2001.
270. Teodorescu, I., Gavrilă, L., Matei, M., Braghina, V, Tîbea, F., Badara, I., Biologie. Genetica, ecologie, evolutionism, VIII, Ed. Didactica și Pedagogica, 1997.
271. Treben, Maria, Sanatate din farmacia Domnului, 1996.
272. Treitschke, H. von, Historische und politische Aufsätze, 1896.
273. Thaxton, C. B., Bradley, W. L., Olson, R. L., Misterul originii vieții. Reevaluarea teoriilor actuale, Philosophical Library. Inc., New York, 1984.
274. The Creationists, Expanded Edition. Harvard University Press; 2006 .
275. The Wedge Strategy, The Center for Renewal of Science and Culture The Discovery Institute, Seattle, Washington, SUA, 1998.
276. Thorwald, I, Macht und Geheimnis der freien Ärzte, München/Zürich 1962
277. Thorwald, J., Macht und Geheimnis der frühen Ärzte, München, 1962
278. Toma, Eugen, Ochii științei spre macrocosmos și microcosmos, Ed.Științifică, București, 1965.
279. Udris, Octavian, Cum a creat Dumnezeu universul din nimic, Editura Tabor, 1994.
280. Valeriu, Rusu, Traian, Baran, Dimitrie D. Branisteanu, Biomembrane și patologie, 1991
281. Vasilescu, Diac. Prof. Dr. Emilian, Istoria Religiei, EIBMBOR, București, 1982.
282. Velimirovici, Episcop Nicolae, Răspunsuri la întrebări ale lumii de astăzi, Traducere din limba sârbă de Adrian Tănăsescu-Vlas, Editura Sophia, București, 2002
283. Vernet, David, Biblia și știința, Ed. Psycho Mass Media, București, 1995.
284. Vladuca, Ion, Elemente de Apologetica Ortodoxă, Ed. Bizantină, București, 1998.
285. Idem, "Adevărul despre evoluționism", Ed. Egumenița, Galați, 2008.
286. Vliangoftis, Pr. Arsenie, Ereziile contemporane – o adevărată amenințare, Ed. Evanghelistos, București, 2006.
287. de Vries, Hugo, Mutationstheorie, 2 vol. Leipzig, Veit, 1901-1903.
288. Waddington, C. H., The Nature of Life (Natura vieții) (New York: Atheneum, 1962).

289. Waldenfels, Hans, Manuel de theologie fondamentale, traduction d'allemand par Olivier Depre et Claude Geffre, Cerf, Paris, 1990
290. Wang, Hao, Kurt Godel, Paris, Armand Collin.
291. Weinberg, Steven, Visul unei teorii finale, În căutarea legilor ultime ale naturii, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2008.
292. Weissmann, Vorträge über Descendenztheorie. 2 vol. Jena, Fischer, 1902.
293. Wells, Spencer, Omul o aventură genetică, Ed.CD Press, București, 2009.
294. Wilber, Ken, The Collected Works of Ken Wilber, Shambala Publications, Boston, 1999, vol.2.
295. Wills, Christopher „Genetic load" („Tara genetică"), Scientific American,222,(martie 1970).
296. Whiteheadis, Alfred North, Adventures of Ideas, Free Press, New York, 1967
297. Whiteheadis, Alfred North, Process and Reality: An Essay în Cosmology, Edition Griffin and Sherburne, The Free Press/Macmillan, New York, 1978
298. Whiteheadis, Alfred North, Science and the Modern World, Free Press, New York, 1997
299. Woodward, Thomas,Doubts about Darwin. A History of Intelligent Design, Grand Rapids, Baker Books, 2003.
300. Wurmbrand, Richard,Marx și satan, Ed.Stephanus, București, 1994.
301. Zavadski, K.M., Kalcinskii, E.I - Evoluția evoluției, Nauka, Leningrad., 1977
302. Zizioulas, Ioannis, Ființa eclesială, Ed. Bizantină, București, 1996.
303. Idem, Creația că Euharistie, Ed. Bizantină, București.

## **V. Resurse Web**

1. Academicianului Radu Voinea, Discursul său de recepție în Academia Română ținut în data de 6.02.2008 [www.acad.ro/com2008/pag\\_com08\\_0206.htm](http://www.acad.ro/com2008/pag_com08_0206.htm)
2. <http://arhivaparlamentului.blogspot.ro/2011/04/structura-genetica-populatiei.html>
3. <http://www.athenian-legacy.com/2010/01/teoria-sintetica-a-evolutiei/>
4. Augustin Păunoiu, Angajamentul lui Darwin față de materialism, <http://www.napocanews.ro/2009/09/angajamentul-lui-darwin-fata-de-materialism.html>

5. Bogdan I Stanciu, Fața întunecată a darwinismului,  
<http://www.creationism.info.ro/blog76/Fa%C5%A3a-%C3%AEntunecat%C4%83-a-darwinismului.htm>
6. <http://campus.udayton.edu/~hume/EvolSynth/evolsynth.htm>;
7. <http://www.crispedia.ro/Racemic>
8. Cornel Dragos, Probabilitati și viața, <http://www.creationism.info.ro/blog73/Probabilit%E3%FEi-%BAi-via%E3%FE.htm>
9. <http://www.crestinortodox.ro/diverse/postmodernismul-provocare-morala-crestina-135569.html>
10. <http://www.crestinortodox.ro/religie-filosofie/perioada-cosmologica/anaximandru-71714.html>
11. <http://www.creationism.info.ro/pagini/oe/oeII.html>
12. Dark face of darwinism, documentar de televiziune.
13. [www.didactic.ro/materiale-didactice/descarcare/128565-](http://www.didactic.ro/materiale-didactice/descarcare/128565-)
14. <http://doegenomestolife.org/>;
15. Firmilian Gherasim, Despre evoluționism, în [www.creationism.info.ro](http://www.creationism.info.ro)
16. <http://gslc.genetics.utah.edu/>
17. Site-ul Universității Harvard: Asa Gray (1810-1888) - Biography.  
<http://www.huh.harvard.edu/libraries/asa/ASABIO.html>
18. <http://www-history.mcs.st-d.ac.uk/Biographies/Maupertuis.html>
19. Ioan Paul II, Mesajul către Academia Pontificală de Științe: Despre evoluție, 22 octombrie 1996, la <http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp961022.htm>
20. Ioan Vladuca, Impotriva Evolutionismului, în site-ul  
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/39732032/ivor-benson-fapte-si-controverse>,
21. Dr.Ing. Ioan Străinescu, Creoționismul științific, Apologetica, 2010, în  
[http://www.doxolog.ro/web/apologetica/Strainescu-Creationismul\\_stiintific/Strainescu-Creationismul\\_stiintific-dreapta.htm](http://www.doxolog.ro/web/apologetica/Strainescu-Creationismul_stiintific/Strainescu-Creationismul_stiintific-dreapta.htm)
22. International Theological Commission, Communion and stewardship: human persons created în the image of God, la <http://www.vatican.va>
23. James B. Stenson, „Evolution: a Catholic Perspective”, Catholic Position Papers, Series A, Number 116, March, 1984, Japan Edition, Seido Foundation for the Advancement of Education, 12-6 Funado-Cho, Ashiya-Shi Japan. Versiunea electronică poate fi găsită la <http://www.ewtn.com/library/humanity/evoltn.txt>
24. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PubMed/>;

25. [http://www.nhgri.nih.gov/DIR/VIP/Learning\\_Tools/genetic\\_illustrations.html](http://www.nhgri.nih.gov/DIR/VIP/Learning_Tools/genetic_illustrations.html)  
;
26. <http://www.ornl.gov/hgmis/>;
27. Politica demografica a regimului nazist în tarile ocupate, la  
[http://ro.altermedia.info/noua-ordine-mondiala/politica-demografica-a-regimului-nazist-in-tarile-ocupate\\_2928.html](http://ro.altermedia.info/noua-ordine-mondiala/politica-demografica-a-regimului-nazist-in-tarile-ocupate_2928.html), dupa Mike W. Perry, "As Many Abortions as Possible"
28. Pr. Dan Badulescu, <http://www.creationism.info.ro/blog118/Cosmologia-divina-si-cea-umana.htm>
29. Pr. Răzvan Ionescu, în articolul „Creaționism, evoluționism și teologia creației” – din [http://www.apostolia.eu/articol\\_39/crea%C5%A3ionism-evolu%C5%A3ionism-%C5%9Fi-teologia-crea%C5%A3iei.html](http://www.apostolia.eu/articol_39/crea%C5%A3ionism-evolu%C5%A3ionism-%C5%9Fi-teologia-crea%C5%A3iei.html), Paris
30. „Rădăcinile controverselor dintre știință și religie”. Emisiune radio „Logos” Craiova, 2007. Reporter Gabriela Voinea, invitat: Ierom. Grigorie Sandu
31. Roberto Masi, „The Credo of Paul VI: Theology of Original Sin and the Scientific Theory of Evolution” L'Osservatore Romano, 17 aprilie 1969, ediția engleză.
32. <http://www.scientia.ro/biografii/111-biografii-chimie/1697-antoine-laurent-de-lavoisier-parintele-chimiei-moderne.html>
33. <http://ro.scribd.com/doc/45638793/Fosile-Vii>
34. <http://ro.scribd.com/doc/71072400/Teoria-Sintetica-a-Evolutiei>.
35. [www.scoalacantemir.ro/files/uploads/Genetica.doc](http://www.scoalacantemir.ro/files/uploads/Genetica.doc).
36. Stefan NEGREA și Alexandrina NEGREA, Bicentenarul nasterii lui Charles Darwin. Omul și opera. în [http://studii.crifst.ro/doc/2009/2009\\_17.pdf](http://studii.crifst.ro/doc/2009/2009_17.pdf) la 09.01.2012.
37. Theobald, Douglas L. “29+ Evidences for Macroevolution: The Scientific Case for Common Descent.” The Talk.Origins Archive. Vers. 2.83. 2004.
38. US churches celebrate 'Evolution Sunday', la [www.ekklesia.co.uk](http://www.ekklesia.co.uk), 13 februarie 2009
39. [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xii/encyclicals/index.htm](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/index.htm) - Humani Generis
40. Why I am Not a Christian. by Bertrand Russell (March 6, 1927).  
<http://www.positiveatheism.org/hist/russell0.htm>
41. [en.Wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)
42. [http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albertus\\_Magnus](http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albertus_Magnus)
43. [ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biserica\\_Unitariană\\_din\\_Transilvania](http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biserica_Unitariană_din_Transilvania)
44. [http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Istoria\\_g%C3%A2ndirii\\_evolu%C8%9Bioniste](http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Istoria_g%C3%A2ndirii_evolu%C8%9Bioniste)

- 45. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ John\\_Stevens\\_Henslow](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Stevens_Henslow)
- 46. [http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis\\_Pasteur.](http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis_Pasteur)
- 47. [http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metod%C4%83\\_%C8%99tiin%C8%9Bific%C4%83](http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metod%C4%83_%C8%99tiin%C8%9Bific%C4%83)
- 48. [http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_Gilbert](http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Gilbert)