

JAKUB PŁOSKI, BARTŁOMIEJ UZAR

Report on the Conference *Philosophy and Christianity. Past – Present – Future*, Institute of Philosophy, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Warsaw, 12-13 June 2025

Abstract. On June 12-13, 2025, the international conference *Philosophy and Christianity. Past – Present – Future* was held at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (UKSW). The event was organized to mark the 60th anniversary of the philosophical journal *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, founded in 1965 at the Faculty of Christian Philosophy of the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw (ATK, now UKSW). The conference gathered participants from academic centers in Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Netherlands, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom, and USA, who specialize in the philosophy of religion and related areas. The program included presentations by scholars representing various academic traditions, all focusing on the relationship between philosophy and Christianity from historical, contemporary, and future-oriented perspectives.

Keywords: *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*; philosophy of religion; philosophy of God; philosophy of science; history of philosophy

The international academic conference *Philosophy and Christianity. Past – Present – Future* took place on 12-13 June 2025 at the Institute of Philosophy of the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (UKSW). The conference brought together scholars from several countries: Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Netherlands, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom, and USA, to discuss the relationship between philosophy and Christianity, focusing on its historical development, key themes such as science, faith and reason, and the role of Christian philosophy in past and present contexts.

The occasion for the conference was the 60th anniversary of the journal *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* (SPCh), established in 1965. Initially edited by the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw (ATK), since the year 2000 the journal has been published by the Institute of Philosophy at UKSW. As one of the oldest Polish philosophical journals, SPCh has

consistently focused on classical and Christian philosophy, especially as it relates to the humanities and social sciences. Its distinctive character lies in the continuation of the classical philosophical tradition within a broadly understood Christian framework, addressing both theoretical and practical issues.

The conference was officially opened by prof. Magdalena Płotka, director of the Institute of Philosophy at UKSW, who welcomed the participants and wished them a rewarding philosophical experience and intellectual enjoyment.

Subsequently, prof. Adam Świeżyński, editor-in-chief of SPCh and the principal organizer of the conference, delivered the opening address. He provided a comprehensive overview of the journal's mission, editorial history, and scholarly contributions. To date, SPCh has published 60 volumes comprising 142 issues and 2715 articles authored by 816 contributors. The journal publishes in both Polish and English and maintains a presence in numerous academic databases and repositories. Guided by the motto "philosophy free from bias," the journal embraces a pluralistic approach, welcoming contributions from diverse philosophical traditions and worldviews.

The conference programme featured presentations organized into seven thematic sessions, each exploring different dimensions of the intersection between philosophy and Christianity.

The first session was entirely dedicated to a lecture by prof. Mark Harris (University of Oxford), titled *Christ Fundamentalism and Quantum Fundamentalism*. Although not a philosopher by training, Harris described himself as "a physicist and theologian who has read a lot about the philosophy of science." In the first part of his talk, Harris addressed the contemporary debate on the relationship between science and religion, noting that it was initiated in the 1960s by Ian Barbour, who founded the journal *Issues in Science and Religion*. He then presented several key approaches within this debate. One is the "critical realism approach," which encourages constructive dialogue between science and religion. The "conflict

thesis approach,” on the other hand, sees them as fundamentally opposed. The “territories of science and religion” approach, developed by Peter Harrison, argues that the categories of science and religion are relatively contemporary and that their separation is historically artificial. The “after science and religion” approach, linked to Harrison, John Milbank, and Paul Tyson, questions the usefulness of the traditional terminology itself, suggesting that the way we usually frame the relationship may be conceptually flawed. Harris also mentioned the “science-engaged theology approach,” which views science as a valuable source for theological insight. Finally, he referred to the “theology of science” perspective developed by Polish scholars such as Michał Heller and Tadeusz Sierotowicz, who argue that science can be treated as a proper subject of theological reflection. According to Harris, the theology of science approach has some important advantages over the more general science and religion approaches. It is more closely connected to fields like the philosophy and history of science, and it may help overcome ongoing problems, such as the common but misleading idea that science and religion are always in conflict. The central part of Harris’s lecture addressed two opposing perspectives on the rational structure and comprehensibility of the physical universe: “Christ Fundamentalism” and “Quantum Fundamentalism.” The former asserts that the universe is fundamentally rational because it proceeds from a rational Creator. The world’s intelligibility, in this view, is a gift rooted in divine intentionality: God is not only the origin of order but is present in the very structure of reality. Rationality thus flows from the Logos, and the comprehensibility of nature reflects God’s revealing presence in creation. Quantum Fundamentalism, by contrast, posits that all entities and events in the universe are reducible to quantum-level processes, and hence ultimately describable by the formal apparatus of quantum mechanics. Importantly, Harris noted that this position does not itself settle the question of how quantum mechanics is to be interpreted, whether in anti-realist modes (e.g., Copenhagen,

information-theoretic, or quantum pragmatism interpretations) or realist ones (e.g., many-worlds, objective collapse, or pilot-wave interpretations). Within this framework, Harris identified a cultural phenomenon he called “Quantum Religion,” a broad and mixed trend that connects quantum ideas with religious or spiritual beliefs. Manifestations of this phenomenon appear across diverse traditions, including Christian theology (e.g., discussions on divine action, indeterminism, or trinitarian models), Eastern religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Daoism), New Age spirituality, and various strands of so-called “quantum mysticism.” In the final part of his lecture, Harris outlined his own position. He began by noting that no one fully understands quantum mechanics, and argued that the rationality and intelligibility of the universe must ultimately come from the activity of the Logos, understood in Christian theology as Christ. From this point of view, “Quantum Fundamentalism” is grounded in “Christ Fundamentalism”: if the universe is created through the Logos, then it can have a deep, ordered, and understandable structure. Christ, as the Logos, provides the underlying pattern and meaning of this particular universe. Based on this, Harris concluded that such a view requires a realist interpretation of quantum mechanics. He rejected anti-realist interpretations as inadequate, and also criticized some realist ones, such as the many-worlds interpretation, which he saw as incompatible with Christian theology, and the objective collapse theory, which he considered ad hoc and lacking explanatory depth. In his view, the pilot-wave interpretation offers the most promising framework.

The second session was devoted to issues in modern philosophy of religion, with particular emphasis on the thought of Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling and Søren Kierkegaard, as well as their reception and influence in twentieth-century philosophical reflection, most notably in the work of Simone Weil.

The session began with João Gouveia (University of Coimbra, Portugal), whose paper *Reason and Christianity in Schelling's Late*

Lectures focused on the role of reason and Christian faith in the final phase of Schelling's thought. Drawing on the *Philosophy of Mythology and Revelation*, Gouveia examined Schelling's shift from a strictly rational system to one that places greater emphasis on historical and religious experience. A central idea was the human will, understood as an infinite striving toward God, which links the God reached by reason and the God revealed in history. Gouveia discussed how this striving may contain a possible state of rest, but only if the will is dissolved into a higher Being. What makes Schelling's argument convincing is that it is developed within the limits of reason, not by going beyond it. Gouveia also noted that, in this context the idea of finding Christ within ourselves does not offer a real solution, because trying to reproduce Christ's experience would return us to the same striving. Even if we encountered a will other than our own, we could only recognize it as leading to God if we rely on rational conclusions. According to Schelling, the recognition that reason cannot reach God is a key moment in the history of religion, especially Christianity, as the path through which God truly reveals himself.

The second paper, *Faith and Reason in Kierkegaard's Leap of Faith*, was presented by independent scholar Philip Højme (Denmark) and focused on Søren Kierkegaard's view of the relationship between faith and reason. Kierkegaard's idea of the leap of faith offers a fundamental challenge to traditional ways of thinking about this relationship, especially the assumption that faith and reason must either be fully compatible or in complete conflict. For Kierkegaard, faith begins precisely where reason reaches its limit, and it involves a deeply personal and existential decision that cannot be fully supported by logical proof. According to Højme, Kierkegaard's view is not simply a philosophical theory but a call to reimagine belief as a transformative act that goes beyond the rational mindset of modern philosophy. In this context, Højme drew attention to Kierkegaard's critique of institutional and dogmatic religion, which he illustrated through the philosopher's use of Danish folk tales, particularly the stories

about the Molboes. These stories, as Højme showed, serve as a satirical commentary on rigid and superficial forms of Christianity, and highlight the absurdities that arise when religion becomes detached from lived, individual experience. The paradoxes of Christian belief, including the impossibility of proving God's existence, are not flaws to be overcome but essential elements of faith as Kierkegaard understands it. Faith is thus not a matter of abstract acceptance but of existential transformation. Højme concluded that Kierkegaard's reflections remain highly relevant today, especially for rethinking Christian philosophy in a world increasingly shaped by scientific reasoning and the demand for objective certainty.

The final paper of the session, *Philosophy and Christianity: Kierkegaard and Weil on Hope as a Response to Crisis*, was presented by Malwina Tkacz (Institute of Philosophy, UKSW). Her presentation offered a comparative reflection on the thought of Søren Kierkegaard and Simone Weil, focusing on how each responds to the experience of crisis within the framework of Christian philosophy. Tkacz examined both existential and social aspects of the crisis, showing how Kierkegaard and Weil reflect on suffering, despair and the possibility of hope. She argued that for Kierkegaard, a crisis leads the individual to a direct confrontation with despair, which can only be addressed through a personal act of faith that involves turning inward toward God. Weil, in contrast, emphasized the importance of compassion and the acceptance of suffering through a quiet openness to divine grace, particularly in the context of injustice and affliction. Although their approaches differ, Tkacz showed that both thinkers see hope not as a form of unreflective optimism, but as a deep trust in God's presence that grows through honest engagement with suffering. Her analysis showed how Christian philosophy, as expressed in their work, can offer meaningful resources for responding to both personal and societal forms of crisis.

The third session was primarily dedicated to themes in contemporary philosophy, with particular attention to the thoughts of Jan

Patočka, Karl Jaspers, Edith Stein, and Eric Voegelin, as well as to the relationship between Christianity and eco-philosophy.

The first paper, *Jan Patočka and Karl Jaspers: Heretics Near and Far*, was presented by Ondrej Sikora (Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic). His presentation focused on how both philosophers developed distinctive approaches to Christianity that Sikora described as “philosophical heresy.” He began by outlining the common intellectual background they shared, including an emphasis on the uniqueness of human existence, a strong connection to German classical philosophy, particularly Kant, an early engagement with Heidegger’s thought, and a consistent interest in the historical dimension of philosophical inquiry. Both thinkers viewed their work as continuing the European philosophical tradition rather than breaking away from it. Despite these similarities, Sikora emphasized important differences in their understanding of religion. Jaspers rejected the exclusive truth claims of Protestant Christianity, but continued to recognize the foundational role of biblical religion in shaping philosophical reflection. He regarded Jesus of Nazareth as a symbol of transcendence while rejecting the idea of Christ as the incarnate God, which he saw as philosophically untenable. Patočka, in contrast, moved toward a more secular interpretation of history and existence, where meaning must be found within human experience without reference to divine judgment or salvation. Sikora noted that although both thinkers remained deeply shaped by Christian categories, the status of their views as forms of heresy is not equal. Jaspers’s position can still be seen as heretical in the proper sense because it engages critically with a religious framework he continues to share. Patočka’s view, however, is more difficult to classify in this way since his concept of human existence is no longer grounded in any particular religious confession. According to Sikora, this makes Patočka’s so-called heresy more ambiguous, as heresy presupposes a shared doctrinal foundation that may no longer be relevant in his case.

The second presentation, titled *Towards a Marian Icon of Philosophy – A Steinian and Voegelinian Approach*, was delivered by William Tullius (American Public University System, USA). His paper addressed the question of how Christian philosophy can be developed in conversation with modern secular thought while remaining rooted in its theological foundations. Tullius began by noting that Christian philosophy is often shaped by figures such as Augustine and Aquinas, whose ideas continue to influence the field. While acknowledging their importance, he suggested that this tradition could be deepened by including a Marian perspective, drawing on Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Fides et Ratio*, which presents Mary as a clear image of philosophy and encourages philosophers to work in her spirit. Tullius proposed that the image of Mary, understood as the “Seat of Wisdom,” offers a meaningful way to rethink both the purpose and practice of philosophy. Drawing on the thought of Edith Stein and Eric Voegelin, he argued that philosophy depends not only on argument but also on the symbolic frameworks it uses to shape its questions and methods. In this context, traditional philosophical images, especially from the Platonic tradition, can be reconsidered through a Marian lens, offering new ways of expressing the search for truth. The figure of Mary, he concluded, provides a model that remains faithful to the Christian tradition while opening philosophy to deeper spiritual insight.

The third paper was presented by Marc Pauly (University of Groningen, Netherlands) and was titled *Saying ‘You’ to Nature: Greening Christianity via Dialogical Philosophy*. Pauly addressed the ecological crisis by examining how the tradition of dialogical philosophy can support a more ecologically sensitive Christian worldview. He began by noting that while there have been efforts to “green” various religious traditions, Christianity holds a special place in this discussion, due to both its wide influence and the fact that it has often been seen as partly responsible for environmental degradation. Drawing on the work of early twentieth-century dialogical thinkers such as

In the fifth section, there were papers on contemporary Italian philosophy and its relation to phenomenology, as well as on some proposals in the bioethical, ethical, and political discussions conducted therein. The last presentation of the fifth section was devoted to the problem of the conscience clause in Christian and secular bioethics.

The first lecture entitled *Italian Christian philosophy toward phenomenology* [*Włoska filozofia chrześcijańska wobec fenomenologii*] was delivered by Tymoteusz Mietelski (Catholic Academy in Warsaw). In his paper, he presented the reaction of Italian Christian philosophers toward phenomenology. He claimed that Husserl's thought spread in Italy with a delay compared to other countries. This resulted from the strong development of philosophical trends related to neo-idealism, conditioned, among other things, by the political situation. As a consequence, other intellectual trends were somehow delayed. The first works by Italian philosophers on Husserl's views appeared only in the 1920s and 1930s. Then this interest faded in favour of existentialist thought. In the 1950s, the so-called second wave of Italian phenomenology began, with two centers: the first was Enzo Paci and his students, the second was the Christian philosophy community. The reaction of Christian philosophers, associated with and sympathetic to the Movimento di Gallarate, proceeded in four directions. The first of these can be described as the acceptance of phenomenology and its definition as oriented toward realism, and consequently leading to the foundation of metaphysics. Advocates of this second trend maintained that the basic task of phenomenology is the description and understanding of data. As such, phenomenology is not a philosophical tradition, but an a-metaphysical methodological approach. This was the relatively most fruitful position. The phenomenological method was used in research on moral experience and in philosophical anthropology. The third trend consisted in rejecting both the thesis about the possibility of founding metaphysics on phenomenology and the thesis about its a-metaphysical

character. Phenomenology here has the more modest task of being pre-metaphysical. Within the fourth trend, attention was drawn to the entanglement of phenomenology in numerous aporias, which were considered insurmountable. By presenting the response of Italian Christian philosophers to one of the most important trends in twentieth-century thought, we reveal the fertility and heuristic power of Christian philosophy.

The next paper, *Who are the "devout atheists"? Bioethical positions of selected representatives of "Christian atheism" in Italy* [Kim są „pobożni ateści”? Stanowiska bioetyczne wybranych przedstawicieli „ateizmu chrześcijańskiego” we Włoszech], delivered by Andrzej Kobyliński (Institute of Philosophy, UKSW), also explored issues in contemporary Italian philosophy. He claimed that in Italy there is a very important intellectual environment that is constituted by “devout atheists,” also called “Christian atheists,” supporters of “Christian atheism” and followers of “secular Christianity.” Such beliefs denote a specific type of worldview, philosophically similar to agnosticism, which is professed by a fairly influential group of thinkers, journalists, politicians, and artists who see an urgent need to protect the Christian tradition as the foundation of freedom and democracy in the Western world. In their opinion, a possible disintegration of the values shaped by this religion would inevitably lead to a crisis and gradual disappearance of the Western cultural model, which is based on the dignity of the human individual, freedom, and democracy. When it comes to a personal approach to faith and religion, advocates of this worldview include atheists, agnostics, and individuals who maintain a certain form of religious sensitivity, while declaring their lack of affiliation with any church or religious organization. The supporters of “Christian atheism” present a critical approach to many manifestations of the contemporary biotechnological revolution. Together with representatives of many other intellectual circles, they see the need for a new humanism, which should constitute a defense of the value and dignity of the human life threatened by certain developments in

science and technology. The main goal of the presentation was to analyze the bioethical views of three proponents of “secular Christianity” in Italy: Oriana Fallaci (1929–2006), Giuliano Ferrara (1952–), and Marcello Pera (1943–).

The last paper of this session was delivered by Anna Szklarska (University of the National Education Commission in Krakow). It was entitled *The problem of the conscience clause in Christian and secular bioethics* [*Problem klauzuli sumienia w bioetyce chrześcijańskiej i świeckiej*]. Szklarska analyzed the issue of the conscience clause in Christian and secular bioethics, with particular emphasis on the arguments (and counterarguments) for and against it. The presentation focused on a specific legal regulation, according to which a doctor may refrain from performing health services that he considers to be inconsistent with his conscience. The legal order introduced by the state and society may be in conflict with the ethical assessment of given practices made by individual doctors. The conscience clause expresses concern for internal balance and therefore aims to promote the work, moral integrity, and sovereign freedom of the doctors. This, however, at the potential cost of the freedom and comfort of patients, exposed to the refusal to perform a service they request and helplessness in the face of systemic difficulties. Medical professions are mentally burdensome; people performing them are particularly vulnerable to professional burnout and moral indifference. It seems that the conscience clause is an important tool that helps doctors maintain inner peace, moral sensitivity, and autonomy. The overarching method serving the paper’s goal, which was the analysis of the problem of the conscience clause in the context of Christian and secularized bioethics, was based on the reconstruction of the most important positions and lines of argument justifying them, the systematization of individual threads, their deepening and development, and their critical interpretation.

In the sixth section, two papers were presented: the first on the role of negative theology in the context of philosophical analyses

of the discourse of love, and the second on the relationship of practical philosophy of nature to Christianity. After this session, participants and speakers took a lunch break.

This session began with a paper by Piotr Karpiński (Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow) entitled *The Apophase of the Discourse of Love. On the Role of Negative Theology in Philosophy* [*Apofaza dyskursu miłosnego. O roli teologii negatywnej w Filozofii*]. Karpiński claimed that negative theology, as formulated in the works of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, can be understood as a way of using language (or even a certain “language game”) that attempts to express the inexpressible and at the same time ensure that the inexpressible can be experienced. This use of language is too quickly considered useless in philosophy, because it is often impractical or contradictory, following the advice of Kant (on the limits of reason) and Wittgenstein (“Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent”). Meanwhile, there are many moments of negative understanding in philosophy. A very telling example is the idea of infinity in Descartes, who writes in his *Replies to Objections V*: “for the idea of the infinite, in order to be true, should in no way be capable of being comprehended, since its very incomprehensibility is contained in the formal essence of the infinite.” Negative knowledge, or elements of the method of negative theology, also appear in Heidegger (the departure from the metaphysics of presence in favour of the gift – *Geben*), in Wittgenstein (6.522. There is indeed the inexpressible. This shows itself; it is the mystical), and in Derrida (*Comment ne pas parler. Dénégations*), to mention only a few examples. So-called negative theology is certainly not limited to the theological domain. In this paper, the erotic phenomenon was analyzed as a privileged moment of the apophatic discourse, or more precisely, the statement that accompanies it: “I love you.” By using the theory of speech acts of J.L. Austin, J. Searle, and S. Cavell, it showed that a declaration of love is not a locutionary or illocutionary act, but a perlocutionary act – it is not about informing someone, but about producing a certain effect in

the recipient (a similar view was also held by R. Barthes). Perlocution is focused on the “you,” it is a pragmatic use of language, and above all, it is possible to observe in it the important work of negativity, characteristic of the three stages of negative theology: cataphase, apophase, and sublimation. The profession of love does not say what it says, it does not provide any certainty, and ultimately turns into the question: “Do you love me?” As an example of such a discourse, Karpiński analyzed the Gospel episode (Jn 21:15-19) in which Jesus asked this question to Peter. In the conclusions, he showed the convergence of negative theology and the discourse of love. Perhaps it is love, despite all the differences between God and the world, that unites theology with philosophy, God with man?

The second paper entitled *Practical philosophy of nature and Christianity* [*Praktyczna filozofia przyrody a chrześcijaństwo*] was delivered by Michał Latawiec (Institute of Philosophy, UKSW). Latawiec began his lecture by stating that the subject of practical philosophy of nature is nature, together with man actively present in it. This presence of man in nature is assessed in the light of the norms formulated to regulate the relationship of man to nature, which can be expressed in the protection of nature. Since the second half of the 20th century, a global voice has been raised regarding the need to protect nature. This resulted from the fact that the natural environment is becoming increasingly degraded and that increasingly difficult conditions for human existence on our planet are becoming apparent. The question arises about the essence and need for such actions. We are looking for effective tools to implement our postulates. The changing world, along with the development of scientific knowledge about biological phenomena, results in constant changes. It results from the fact that we are constantly looking for an adequate justification for the need to protect nature. This discussion is also taking place within the Catholic Church. Aspects of broadly understood ecology are also seen in papal encyclicals, especially in *Laudato Si* (Francis). Although the issue of environmental protection is not the most important topic

in contemporary Christianity, this subject is being discussed more and more often. An example is the activity of the Ecological Movement of St. Francis of Assisi. The aim of this paper was to indicate the possible role of Christianity in the search for a way to safeguard the human presence in the natural environment. Therefore, it is about indicating the assumptions on which the proposed protection of nature can be justified. Contemporary arguments for the protection of nature were also discussed.

Session seven was devoted to the paper of the keynote speaker Robert A. Larmer (University of New Brunswick, Canada). He delivered the lecture *Two Unsuccessful Objections to the Apologetic Worth of Miracles*. In his presentation, Larmer aimed to examine two common objections to the apologetic worth of miracles. These are: 1. the objection that it would take an inordinate amount of evidence to establish the occurrence of certain events such as the Resurrection of Jesus, and 2. the objection that even if such events could justifiably be held to have occurred, it would be more rational to attribute them to unknown natural causes than to supernatural intervention. He argued that both objections are mistaken. First, given that miracles should not be defined as violating any laws of nature, and that the common objection that the occurrence of a miracle is inconsistent with the truth of the principle of the conservation of energy is mistaken, no balance of probabilities argument based on a conflict between the evidence for the laws of nature and the evidence for a miracle is possible. This means that Hume's argument in part one of his *Of Miracles*, based as it is on a presumed conflict between these two bodies of evidence, can find no purchase as regards the task of assessing the rationality of belief in a reported miracle. Second, the claim that the progress of science provides a strong inductive argument against ever believing an event to be a miracle is mistaken. Rather, the progress of science provides a strong inductive argument that the occurrence of certain event types would best be understood as instances of supernatural intervention. If as time goes

on our increased scientific knowledge makes it ever more difficult to provide an explanation of an event in terms of natural causes, and if the event can be seen as furthering what we reasonably take to be God's purposes, then this provides even stronger warrant for believing the event to be the result of supernatural intervention, i.e., a miracle. The claim that the progress of science undermines the rationality of belief in miracles appears, therefore, mistaken. Given good reason to believe that certain events have in fact happened, for example the resurrection of Jesus, the progress of science has strengthened rather than weakened the claim that these events are in fact miracles. The argument from miracle, therefore, deserves, as it has in the past, to play an ongoing central role in Christian apologetics.



Photo 2. From the left: Adam Świeżyński (SPCh Editor-in-Chief), Robert A. Larmer, Mark Harris, Dariusz Kucharski (SPCh Assistant Editor)

During the eighth, and final session of the conference, the first two speakers focused on the relationship between technology (including the tools it offers) and Christianity, philosophy, and education. The last paper concerned the way of understanding the very notion of Christian philosophy.

The first talk by Lorenzo Moises Festin (De La Salle University Manila, Philippines) was titled *Technological Structures and Strictures: Christianity's Journey across Shifting Philosophical Landscapes*. Festin formulated the following problem: given the prevalence of materialist philosophies and postmodernity, how could Christianity navigate through the current shifting philosophical landscape? Through ages past, the Christian faith has encountered various philosophical worldviews. And yet, not only did it endure all these but also came out stronger with the emergence of its own philosophy. Elaborated in the categories of the Ancient Greek tradition, Christian Philosophy in its rise attests to the possibility of its being enriched by such encounters. This was the case especially in its germinal state, with the early Christians living out their faith within a pagan world. Initially indifferent toward its philosophies, they could not but come up with apologetic defenses, employing the same categories as their opponents' philosophical critiques. In the end there emerged a philosophy that is distinctly Christian, grafted within the Greek philosophical traditions. Couldn't Christianity do the same in the present context? In this paper, Festin argued that the Christian faith need not be shielded from current philosophical perspectives. By identifying the salient features of postmodernity, he considered how these may be taken within the framework of the Christian worldview. Festin took into account the conduct in which Christianity engages itself in interreligious dialogues, and from there extrapolated the prospects of engaging in a similar dialogue with the philosophies underpinning a highly secularized worldview. Indeed, as Pope Francis points out in *Fratelli tutti*, religious perspectives are often marginalized in public debate. It is thus expedient for Christianity to engage in a dialogue not only with other religious traditions but also with those that take a purely secular stance. This requires not only finding common ground with them but also openness toward the prospect of acknowledging their contributions within the political world, without compromising the tenets of the Christian faith.

The second presentation in this session by Jacek Grzybowski (Institute of Philosophy, UKSW) was entitled *Artificial Intelligence and the University. In What Way Will AI Change Our Approach to Education – Methodological and Ethical Perspective*. The starting point of Grzybowski's considerations was that the extremely dynamic development of artificial intelligence (AI) raises an unavoidable question about the future and direction of education, especially at the higher levels. The current expansion of AI is leading to situations where we will not be able to verify whether a given work of literature or a piece of art are the result of human effort (i.e. whether they have come into being as a result of human creativity) or whether they have been generated by computer programming algorithms. We are already aware of the impact artificial intelligence is having on our everyday lives, so we cannot disregard its influence on educational tasks pertaining to schools and universities. Observers of technological changes may rightly ask whether AI development and its takeover of various human competences will inevitably disavow all work based on reading, acquiring knowledge, inferring, discovering, writing and producing scientific or literary works? Does the development of AI bring us closer to the controversial but probable statement that at some point the will and efficiency of human agents will become unnecessary and even superfluous? Will it not come to the point where the very source of literature or art will be of no importance to us? We will no longer ask who – a human being or a machine – created a certain work, the only evaluation criterion being its reception and the impression it makes on the recipient's mind. The above considerations lead Grzybowski to suggest that widening the range of possibilities for using AI will most likely force schools and universities to reform their current teaching methods. He drew attention to the four most important challenges that schools and universities will face in the near future. The first is the problem of failing to distinguish between real and fake master's and doctoral theses, the second is the loss of critical thinking in the era of fake news and hallucinations created by

artificial intelligence, the third is the active help AI gives to lecturers, and the fourth is a systematic disregard toward acknowledging the achievements of predecessors in newly created scientific works. In the lecture he asked: how should we model a university that would be able to meet the challenges described above?

The last paper of the conference, delivered by Marek Pepliński (University of Gdansk), was devoted to the very concept of Christian philosophy and was entitled *An Academic and Non-academic Conception of Philosophy as a Tool for Understanding the Controversies Surrounding the Notion of Christian Philosophy*. Pepliński noticed that the issue of the coherence of the concept of Christian philosophy and the possibility of an original Christian philosophy became a subject of controversy in the first half of the 20th century, involving figures such as Émile Bréhier, Étienne Gilson, Maurice Blondel, and Fernand Van Steenberghen. The fact that this issue remains relevant is evidenced, on the one hand, by ongoing discussions among philosophers, particularly in Anglophone philosophy since the 1990s, and on the other hand, by John Paul II's philosophically inspiring encyclical *Fides et Ratio*. The controversy over the concept of Christian philosophy is primarily related to the perception of philosophy as a theoretical endeavour concerned with pursuing a specifically defined truth about reality. From this perspective, Christianity is a matter of faith, and its corresponding cognitive enterprise is theology, which relies on Revelation and divine authority. Philosophy, however, is a matter of reason, a search for truth conducted through natural means, emphasizing that justification and proof cannot appeal to premises of faith as they are – or should be – inter-subjective. Thus, the very concept of Christian philosophy seems to be an oxymoron or simply impossible. On the other hand, it is a historical fact that early Christians identified themselves as philosophers and understood Christianity as a philosophy. This identification is linked to the ancient conception of philosophy as comprising two closely related aspects: a theoretical one, associated

with the pursuit of knowledge, and a practical one, as a way of life and a pursuit of happiness. Another relevant historical fact is Christianity's undeniable and multifaceted influence on philosophical thought. The presentation proposed an understanding of philosophy broader than academic conceptions of philosophical inquiry solely oriented toward knowledge and understanding. In simplified terms, such academic notions view philosophy primarily as a cognitive practice concerned with producing philosophical texts and statements that objectify subjective cognitive results in a form that is, in some way, considered scientific. The methodological approach proposed, named the macro-method of philosophizing, consists of five elements: the philosopher and his intellectual construction, the threefold activity of philosophizing, the aims of philosophizing, the results of philosophizing, and the object of philosophizing. The paper then demonstrated how different solutions to the question of Christian philosophy can be analyzed using this framework. To this end, Pepliński referred to the ancient conception of philosophy, drawing on the reflections of Pierre Hadot, Juliusz Domański, and George Karamanolis; to John Wippel's Thomistic approach to the relationship between philosophy and Christianity; and to the work of contemporary analytic philosophers who have addressed the issue of Christian philosophy, such as Alvin Plantinga and Marilyn McCord Adams. The paper argued that considering various perspectives allows for a fuller understanding of philosophy, making it a more attractive endeavour than it would be if reduced solely to academic philosophy. It concluded by reflecting on the possibility of an authentic, original Christian philosophy within modern universities.

After the eighth session the conference was closed by the current Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* – Adam Świeżyński, who thanked the conference participants. He also expressed his special thanks to those who were once part of the SPCh editorial team: Professor Anna Latawiec, who served as editor-in-chief for many years, and Professor Anna Lemańska, who was editorial

secretary and deputy editor-in-chief. He also announced the publication of an article on the history of the SPCh in issue 1/2025.

JAKUB PŁOSKI

Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie

(Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0074-2683>

j.ploski@uksw.edu.pl

BARTŁOMIEJ UZAR

Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie

(Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2240-1310>

bartlomiejuzar@gmail.com

DOI 10.21697/spch.2025.61.S.03

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. (CC BY-ND 4.0).

Received: 9/07/2025. Reviewed: 25/10/2025. Accepted: 12/11/2025.

