Philosophy, Science and Common Sence

Dr. Sudhakar Jally

ABSTRACT

In this paper there is an attempt to discuss the relationship between Science, Social Science and common sense. All are knowledge-seeking but their enquiries in all cases are not same. The objectivity in Science through factual evidence is of paramount importance. Scientific knowledge is reliable and objectively proved. Science is understood through its nature, method and justification. Social Science may be treated as socio-cultural aspect of human behavior. The knowledge derived from Social Sciences through research and investigation is mainly towards the development and progress of socio-individual relationship with moral value having human significance. Its method is also analytical and persuasive through scientific analysis in terms of factual scrutiny and objective discovery. But, both Science and Social Science are concerned with worldly affairs and the pursuit of knowledge is advanced in both keeping in tune with their respective aims and programmes. Both Science and Social Science attempt (in their way) to avoid mysticism, dogmatism and different types of prejudices.

Keywords: transcendental/transempirical; paradigm; noumena; quixotic

Section-I

Science is considered as the source of objective knowledge. Scientific Knowledge is reliable, objectively proved. An important aspect of science is method of unprejudiced inquiry. Science is understood through its nature, method and justification. It is based on either/or both observation and experiment. Science is always persuasive and necessary being based on evidence. It admits only the rational mind and limits itself with the objective principles. The activity of the Scientist is limited (not in the pejorative sense but as a matter of fact) to work within framework of the paradigm and to engage in the activity of problem-solving. Hypothetic-deductive method is used by science.

Science is mostly engaged in how the nature operates. By the way of meeting this question scientific pursuit is involved invention/discovery in different aspect of natural phenomena by way of observation and experiment and on the basis of that it does not hesitate to change and modify the prevailed established scientific views. In that way it is not for maintaining anything as the true/absolutely true but as probable not at all in

1. Coordinator , P.G Department of Philosophy, Utkal University

any pejorative sense but rather quite plausible and meaningful. In addition to this questions relating to 'why' and 'how' are also entertained in scientific inquiry to locate its cause and such allied points in the empirical framework. And, it is also interesting to note here anything that is regarded as transcendental/transempirical both in practice and principle in absolute sense of the term (i.e. purely speculative and metaphysical) are ignored and avoided. Such speculation may be initially taken as a provisional supposition but that can't be avoided as scientific Knowledge.

Section-II

There has been some talk about mysticism in certain scientific as well as social scientific problems. Certain problems that occur usually are not readily solved by the existing moved and methodology adopted in such fields. So without any satisfactory and plausible explanations of those problems, such issues or questions without being properly accounted for remains somewhat obscure and mystical. But from this it does not necessary/logically imply such problems are unsolvable or unanswerable in principle. The scientific inquiries all along remains to be free and open minded to seek further in its respective pursuit and investigation. Nothing is pre-presume that anything which appears to be obscure at the present state continue to be show in principle. Such kind of rigidity is not entertained. Unlike religious mysticism, scientific mystical does not succumb to any such unproved personal realization of anything whatsoever. That is not communicable to anybody as a matter of fact. Privacy in any form is not entertained thereby.

In scientific enquiry we find the regular use of such seemingly neighboring concepts like hypothesis, prediction, forecast, foretelling and so on. It may be noted that such terms are used in the realm of science primarily on the basis of past experience and certain conclusions are thereby arrived at which are often regarded as scientific findings. For instance Lunar/Solar eclipses are predicted by the pursuit of such scientific investigation and yield correct result. In similar way scientific investigation embraces prophecy foretelling and weather fore-caste etc. Even if there are not found to be fully accurate as a matter of fact there are some minor deviation; in large cases those are found to be true. Accordingly the scientific basis of such issues is not ignored. But non-scientific realms, such instances like guesses, surmise, and speculation which have no reasonable foundation in the phenomenal plain even in principle and never conjecture without any sound basis are found to be nothing more than prejudiced-dogmatic bias. That is how one notices subtle and legitimate distinction between conjectures in science and conjectures in religion.

Social Science maybe treated as socio-cultural aspect of human behavior. It studies social behavior of the mammalian species i.e. Homo sapiens. Social Scientist would say that main objective of social science is the study of dis-function and malfunction of the society. According to Karl Popper,the major problem in social life is dogmatic thinking and behavior. Again, Popper stated that society should be instrumental with problems solving. This process of problems solving consists of amicable proposal which is free from error. Science is distinguished from myths and miracles.

Such account of the Social Science by a forenamed distinguished thinker that this main activity of social scientist is not to advocate dogmas etc. but is rather keep on exposing such dogmas privilege in social functioning in different forms with the purpose of avoiding and eradicating such dogmas privilege in social functioning in different forms with the purpose of avoiding and eradicating such dogmas from the frontiers of knowledge and justification.

Section-III

Usually it is noticed that nobody, whether intellectual or business or labour or farmer have common sense and have knowledge on that basis to a considerable extent. But it is also noticed that knowledge acquire through common sense is not that clear and precise. But somewhat vague because those are not structured in or organize, methodical and disciplined manner. That is why for any serious quest for acquiring knowledge, one move beyond common sense to arrive at somewhat technically approved theoretical knowledge which is the foundation of its practical application.

In other words, common sense – knowledge is not totally useless or absurd but rather it requires organized systematization that is how mostly one moves for common sense to something beyond i.e. varieties of scientific pursuit, so that one can arrive at certitude and accuracy. In a word it would not wrong to suggest that commonsense knowledge works as a stepping stone for further technical as well as theoretical advancement of knowledge.

In that way one comes across multifarious scientific studies like Physical Science, Biological Science, Formal science and also Social Sciences. The method and the data taken up studies and research in such Sciences are not same. For instance, the Physical and Chemical studies of matter and organism though, deal with not exactly same data, yet do depend upon observation and laboratory testing of the relevant state of affairs. Biological Sciences in general depend on the study of plants and animals and bring out there views in that particular dimension. Formal Sciences like logic and Mathematics do not directly deal with Physical states of matter and organism but deal with abstract form, numbers and vigorously try to explore and expose different forms and abstraction. Which do have indirect necessary application on the practical realm of facts?

Social Sciences, on the other hand, give emphasis on multiple application of social relationship with the individuals in various states of living and workout for systematic view avoiding some-what confusing and misleading opinion of the past.

Because of not taking dipper varieties of scientific enquiries, common sense, though it acquiring knowledge is not that systematic, well ordered and organized. It is because of that mostly common sense knowledge remains inadequate and disorganized. It has vague sense of generalization and therefore can't be fully relied upon.

"The goal which science aims at is precisely the goal towards which common sense vaguely and ineffectually struggles, namely, the solving of the riddles of the world. Thomas Huxley was so impressed by this fact that he insisted:"Science is nothing but trained and organized common sense.[1]

Unlike physical Sciences, Psychology is also empirical with a remarkable difference that it studies not the Bodily-mechanism as such but the different forms of mental activities of the individual and its impact on the respective bodies, it is therefore a psychic studies though within the empirical dimension.

Conclusion

In the recent past, there is also the advancement of scientific pursuit in collaborating different Sciences by way of investigating, certain common platforms applicable to each of them. So that a plausible types of knowledge can be opted. In that way, once comes across Astrophysics, Oceanography, Geo-physics, Historiography and so on. However, one thing is to be noted that all such pursuit of knowledge in its different type are phenomenal bound meaningful. Any transgress of the phenomenal limit and to move beyond i.e.noumena or physics for the purpose of arriving at certain stipulate conclusions remains, conjectural and some-what also quixotic.

References

1. Gardon Scott, The History and Philosophy of Social Science, Rutledge, London.
2. Watts Cunningham G., Problems of Philosophy, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi-110002
3. Winch Peter, The Idea of Social Science, Rutledge, London.
4. Webb Keith, An Introduction to Problems in the Philosophy of Social Sciences, PINTER, New York.
5. Watts Cunningham G., Problems of Philosophy, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi-110002,PP22-23