

Review of: "[Commentary] Biology as a postmodern science: Universals, historicity, and context"

Miloš Milovanović¹

¹ Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have more remarks on what the author did not say than when what he did.

First of all, the question arises what is the purpose of the paper.

I ask that because there is no literature in the manuscript and therefore the context is not very clear.

Some references to literature might be:

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/information-and-the-nature-of-reality/D0893810640853E41135A6385F166318>

<https://www.amazon.com/Return-Cosmology-Postmodern-Science-Theology/dp/0520054652>

<https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-92192-7>

Separating biology from modern sciences, author haven't discern that he has also separated it from postmodern ones. I refer exactly to mathematics and physics which are contextually dependent as well. One might say that the truth criterion in contemporary science is based upon a postmodern aesthetics.

<https://www.springerprofessional.de/en/aesthetical-criterion-in-art-and-science/18117112>

It is not necessary to emphasize the significance of history for mathematics in particular.

The problem is neglected so often, since one should think that mathematics is the only possible one.

Spengler has demonstrated however that each civilization has its own mathematics.

<https://vtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Literature/TheDeclineOfTheWest>

There are also some attempts to consider the history in a mathematical manner.

See e.g. Todor Vulic

<https://www.korisnahnjiga.com/autor-todor-vulic>

The paper might be improved respecting that.

