

Rosen, Edward

[According to Professor Olszewski...]

Organon 1, 231

1964

Artykuł umieszczony jest w kolekcji cyfrowej Bazhum, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych tworzonej przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego.

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie ze środków specjalnych MNiSW dzięki Wydziałowi Historycznemu Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



branches of science are undergoing a process of bifurcation, but we do observe a process of integration too, some branches of science being joined in one, as for example in the case of cybernetics.

Professor Kedrov claims besides that the contemporary science is undergoing a process of integrating, because we observe that in between two sciences as for example physics and chemistry there appears a new branch — physical chemistry. But the process of integrating is, I think, a very specific one, as no individual is able to have an outlook on the whole body of science. Such an outlook is like a platonic idea — it exists for the mankind as a whole, but an individual is today further from catching it, than ever in the history of mankind. The development of science is very, very rapid; a physicist, for example, cannot grasp the whole of physics. (Professor Oppenheimer quoted as an example that he had taken part in a symposium of physics when the fundamental paper was understood only by very few participants of the meeting. An integrating outlook on the whole body of science is therefore for an individual of our time a platonic idea.

I suppose that these remarks are an example of the usefulness of collaboration between historians and philosophers of science. Prof. Kedrov's paper seems to me essentially right, but it would be necessary to clarify such concepts as simplicity, analysis and synthesis and the understanding of the logic of choosing the explanatory postulates.

E. Rosen

According to Professor Olszewski, periods in political history are sharply defined, whereas periods in the history of science and technology are not sharply defined. But in political history, some periods are not sharply defined, for instance, the fall of the Roman Empire. And in the history of observational astronomy, we know the year and the day, and very nearly the minute, when the period of telescopic observations began. The same may be said also for the beginning of the period of radio astronomy.

A. A. Zvorykine

Professor Olszewski's lecture attracts the attention of all the historians of science and technology as both from the theoretical and practical point of view every scientist — when preparing works concerning the history of science and of technology — ought to resolve in