

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

Yuksel Sarac Yesilada¹

¹ Karabuk University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this article, the author narrows down the content of the discussion considerably by addressing his claim at only few points. Before writing a review for such an article, I think it should answer the following questions.

Firstly, does saying that biology is a postmodern science mean that it is anti-science? Because anyone who reads this article can say that this is the conclusion the author reached. Could emphasizing the absence of elements other than relativity and subjectivity in biology, rather than the basic features of natural sciences, lead us to question the nature of this science as "science"? Why should the theory of evolution in biology, which remains valid as a theoretical framework in all living things, contradict universality, one of the radical features of the sciences? As Dobzhansky stated that nothing in biology can be meaningful to be explained outside the evolutionary theory, can't the theory of evolution be considered to be universal and explanatory for all living things, similar to the universal and uncompromising principles of the sciences? Why should it be different from other sciences? Just because he can't make precise predictions, even if it is based on the laws of physics and chemistry? But this evolutionary principle is enough to consider it universal: that an entity cannot be examined and evaluated outside its own context. This principle or perspective is valid and meaningful for all living things studied in biology, and is even a universal feature of biological science. Although random events and certain situations play a decisive role in the basic principles of biology, which studies the living world and therefore makes predictions that are too imprecise to be expressed with mathematical equations, can these features of biology be enough to draw it into the middle of the debates about the attitudes of the postmodern understanding towards science? Lastly, what makes saying that while natural sciences have scientific and historical truth (or objective truth), that biology has only historical truth, is different from saying that biology has no scientific side at all? The explanations that the author considers sufficient imply that there is no such difference, although she does not aim at this point knowingly or unknowingly. This stance of the author is inconvenient because it directs the reader to the question I first wrote. So, this also needs to be detailed.

In short, I find the author's explanations about biology being a postmodern science due to some of its features inadequate, because this short text, which only touches on certain points, leaves the questions I wrote above open-ended. Of course, each of the questions I posed above regarding the author's claims about biology based on the laws of physics and chemistry may constitute the subject of an article. However, briefly including these questions in the article could have saved it from a shallow appearance. If appropriate answers to these questions are adequately justified, a review of the article can be more satisfying. The positive side of the article is that it is pregnant with several problems and discussions that are open to discussion and can be a source of many academic studies.

