

From [A Postmodern Perspective on Curriculum](#), by William Doll, 1993

Taken from :

Chapter 3: THE BIOLOGICAL WORLDVIEW

[Those] who work in the so-called soft science...have often suffered from 'physics envy'. They have strived to practice their science according to their clouded vision of physics.

Gould, 1981, p. 262

Most general histories of 'science' have been written by historians of physics who have never quite gotten over the parochial attitude that anything that is not applicable to physics is not science.

Mayr, 1982, p.14

All science is either physics or stamp collecting.

Rutherford, 1984, p. 79

These quotations make two obvious points and one not so obvious point:

1. In modernist thought, physics has been the canonical model for *all* science.
2. The social sciences, including education, in trying to 'scientize' their disciplines have adopted a shallow and mistaken view of what constitutes science.
3. The less obvious point is that in using physics as the model, the social sciences have excluded the concept of interaction. This has had devastating effects on curriculum since it is interaction that forms the heart of growth. Physics, at least in its Newtonian form, has no view of growth and a most limited view of interaction - that of machines running down through friction and of objects moving through external force only. As Newton's first law of motion states, objects at rest stay that way. The cause-and-effect relationship implied here is an apt metaphor for the modernist concept of teaching and learning: One precedes and causes the other. Teaching becomes didactic and directing; not aiding, helping, stimulating, or challenging natural self organizing processes.

During this week's Forum, we will discuss the paragraph and quotes above, please stop by RLM 6.104 at 2pm on Friday if you are interested!