

The chief limitation of natural science is that it is not human. But we have to live with human beings—including ourselves—and nearly all the problems of life are human, whereas the problems and subject-matter of physics, chemistry and biology are not. When we enter their laboratories, we find little human there, except ourselves, and our fellow-workers. We are in a world of cells, elements, atoms (or whatever substitute for them the latest analysis reveals). There are obvious dangers in living in such a world.

It is too unlike the world of men to be a good preparation for it. The fundamental reality in that world is human personality. The ideal society is a community of such personalities, self controlling, self developing, self respecting and respecting others. But natural science is not concerned with personality, at least in this sense and in these relations : we may be inclined to ignore its difference from the laboratory, and even to treat men as if they were elements or cells. It is perhaps their training which explains why some scientists are sympathetic with communism. (191 words)

Title should preferably be a phrase, not a sentence.

Natural Science Lacks Humanity

Dealing with building blocks of humans instead of humanity is a limit of natural sciences. Although we live with humans, yet we deal with cells, elements, and atoms, which is practically less useful. We find little humanity in laboratories. The ideal society comprises ~~of~~ personalities with self-control, self-respect, and respect for others, while natural sciences lack these. Therefore, some scientists are sympathetic with communism.

Total words 193

Procs: 65

Other titles:

- 1) Natural sciences versus humanity
- 2) Personality Development: a limit of Natural Science

Idea and grammar are generally ok.

'Comprise' is not followed by 'of', 'Consist' is followed by 'of'.