

Carmen Dubland

September 12, 2017

In the first few chapters of “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” by Thomas S. Kuhn he explains what he classifies as a paradigm: “universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners” (preface, xlii). With this, is he suggesting that all scientific achievements will change as we gain further knowledge, and if so how could the fundamental aspects of nature be further examined and be changed at a future time; for example, the laws of gravity and speed of light. How could these be improved on and changed at a different time?

Kuhn describes normal science as “research firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements, achievements that some particular scientific community acknowledges for a time supplying the foundation for its further practice.” (10) Comparing the definitions of both paradigm and normal science, how are they different?

Kuhn also suggests that most theories and scientific revolutions now are based on and have a bias towards previous findings; does he think that this is a bad thing and how should young scientists aim their research as to not be influenced by previous findings? Or does he believe that previous findings can now be more precise and correct than they previously were- even though they are based on old paradigms?