

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

Miles W. Furnell

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I feel that the article might benefit from some clarification regarding both the the author's objectives and the scope of the term postmodern insofar as it relates to biology. In the absence of context we are offered only opinion as to the validity of the postmodernist position in relation to biology as a science. But to what end?

There are also some observations that I find to be problematic.

The term 'just more efficient' in reference to selection is a particularly minimalist perspective that runs into difficulty in those instances where a little flab has proven to be more beneficial as far as fitness is concerned. Perhaps the term 'effective' might be more appropriate?

Another area of consternation is reference to teleology and, specifically, 'function that attains a goal.' Regenerative processes predominate throughout nature in both biotic and abiotic systems, not necessarily because they achieve a goal but because they are self-perpetuating within the functional context of the broader system. Does the Venus Flytrap, for example, have a goal or is it simply that the