

see entries in Journal, Sept. 28
540036

Science and Humanities

By sci. is meant social and physical (natural), by humanities is meant initially those subjects often grouped in humanities (e.g. poetry, literature, some philosophy, some history, classics, etc.) and ultimately it will be our purpose to establish a truer meaning of humanities and hence a truer meaning of science.

The origins of human thought and action.
Relation of life processes and thought
Creative thought, ---- expressive, evaluational
Instrumental thought ---
Action is instrumental

Science includes contemplative and manipulative statements but there is no essential difference between the two.

What is difference between fact statement appearing in a novel and one in a soc. sci. monograph.

Is a novel a developmental construct worked out retrospectively?
Is it an imaginary combination of valuations with the true factual developments that would surround such an evaluational structure?

Is it then the same as science?
Is the scientific tale or fiction the connecting link between ~~the~~ literature and science?

What makes a science a science is not scientific language
is not precision
is not substantive character of statements
is not omniscience
is not training
is not technique

is a different structure of evaluations. The fact statements of science are ultimately ordered by a general agreement within all problems in the scope of the science
this is less true in soc. sci.
It is most untrue of literature (poetry), where the uniqueness of evaluational structure is the most highly respected part of the presentation.

The projective nature of value

The valuational nature of fact

The fictional nature of science

The essential similarity of poetry and science

Function \rightarrow projection \rightarrow agreement (high or low) \rightarrow

product.

"The Unity of Humanities and Science"

Add: No diff. in detail

no diff. in place on continuum of universal/particular

no diff. in place in controversy: determinism/free will

Functional or vocation difference = literateurs are not skilled experimentalists. They cannot test truths, they cannot test i. e. fact statements that they use. They must already be tested or at least hypothetically tenable. (Correspondingly, scientific hypotheses may be extracted from poetry). Also they may build a fantasy on statistical untruths i. e. if 90% do A and 10% B, a poet may build his story around one of the 10%. He may not however generalize B's to the universe. He must restrain himself or make clear in his communication the distorted character of the perception described in terms of reality.

Role of the ambiguous or vague words, thoughts, sentences that abound in literature = the role of myths, fictions, the vaguely agreeable or compromising words that allow action to result. These are not science, but neither are they anti-science. They are descriptive of a reality that is common to action. The poet may himself analyze their character or, especially if he is an expressive or emotive poet, let the words exist w/o explanation, like music, and even then they cannot be criticized for being un or anti scientific. They are sui generis - modes of organizing and communicating on a non-scientific plane.

(Needed: mode of handling = conversation in poetry: when a character says "abcd" is this to be handled as a fact statement, a preference, an expectable response within the limits of his character, a description of his character, etc.?) Answer = ALL)

(Over)

In demonstrating these differences take and compare

A. A general statement of pol. relevance from lit. (poetry)

B. A closely similar and agreeable statement from pol.sci.

& compare A. A statement about an individual (e.g. a pol, a burocrat,
a king) from lit.

B. A closely similar and agreeable statement from pol.sci.

Cf as to: purpose of the statements in each place; their role. Try
to get statements of ="truth," "kind", degree of precision

Problem of relations between social science and humanities most perplexing. Latter is certainly 2/3 social science using conventional modern definition of scope and method of social science. Rest is ? - - creative, unique, fantasy, - - If there are principles for teaching latter then they are like any other application of science in essence. If not, what are these things. I think more and more that the essential differences between Social Science and Humanities lie not in creativity-reliability continuum but in the unmanageability-manageability and standardized value-unstandardized value continuum. Creativity itself is thinkable (i. e. capable of sci.observ.) but un-controllable, relatively.

Hence we have both humanities and social science as the same events and studies. The differences may be defined as unstandardization, unmanageability, unconformism.

Suggestion for social science-humanities-natural science comparisons.

Select books in each science and branch of literature and poetry. Use sample of 1st sentences appearing on every 3rd page or similar selection, as basis for analyzing types of thoughts and statements. This will not be conventional content analysis, however, since I will be intent on the full contextual meaning of the selected sentences from knowing fully what each work says in its entirety, something content analysis by sample doesn't or cannot cope with. It would defeat my purpose to try to analyze each sentence only on its face.

(I need little save secretarial and footman help on this book) but do need plenty of free time. It can't be delegated.)