Journal of Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology

Commentary Open Access

Science, Technology, Society and History of Biomedicine

George K Paraskevas*

Department of Anatomy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

C e a

e relationship between medicine and the study of life is as old as medication itself. Nevertheless, historians have highlighted the excellent transformation that happened in the 19th century while rst physiology and then bacteriology have become important resources for the classi cation, diagnosis, and treatment of human diseases [1]. In that period, signi cant links developed between the sites specializing in biological experimentation (i.e. laboratories) on the only hand, and the locations of healing (i.e. hospitals, dispensaries) and public tness o ces at the other. Together, they helped to fashion modern, professional medicine [2]. However, many historical studies have additionally argued that this mobilization of biological knowledge exerted a limited impact on medical practice in general, and clinical practice in particular.

e transformation of biology and medicine, and their convergence a er 1945, is far from being uncharted territory for historians. Several research have discovered a step change in the scale of investment in research, a new role for the kingdom as scienti c entrepreneur, an increasingly fundamental level of investigation in biology and medicine, and a closer relationship between the laboratory and the clinic.

at the post-war period saw the growth of biomedical complexes characterized by the intensi cation of research in the life sciences, the hunt for novel molecules, and a new alliance between biologists and the state, should not obscure the fact that it also saw renewed tensions and nearby variations, which challenge any description of it as the culmination of a uniform trend. Firstly, there were tensions between three di erent types of medicine: experimental medicine, clinical medicine, and social medicine. Although biomedicine has, above all, been dominated by experimental medicine, other sets of practices have persisted along those employed by the experimenter, such as molecular modelling and analysis, and biomedical scientists have developed complex relationships with sanatorium clinicians and public health o cials, which have numerous from arms-duration distance, to mutual inter-dependence, and extra rarely to outright collaboration.

History of biomedicine is a hybrid domain, intersecting with many other scholarly disciplines. From the 1970s, historians who investigated recent traits in medicine increasingly shared the approaches, presuppositions, and strategies of inquiry of historians and sociologists of science and technology. One reason is that the increasing reliance of medicine on technologies, instruments, and tablets makes the demarcation between “medicine,” “science,” and “industry” more di cult. Another is the “practice turn” in the records of science, which gave more attention to the ways scientists and physicians work. e impressive achievements of historians who applied these new approaches came, however, at a cost. e neglect of an earlier generation of historians of medicine may have con ned extra latest pursuits for understanding health and ailment in society. Closer hyperlinks with historians of science and technology and sociologists of technology can also additionally have blurred the speci city of medicine as a domain grounded in the di erence among the regular and the pathological and lessened scholars’ interest in “the clinic” as a unique site of the production of knowledge [3].

***Corresponding author:** George K Paraskevas, Department of Anatomy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece, E-mail: kishoresrivastava@434gmail.com

Received: 03-Feb- 2022; Manuscript No. jcmp-22-55213; **Editor assigned:** 5-Feb-2022, Pre QC No. jcmp-22-55213 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 21 -Feb-2022, QC No. jcmp-22-55213; **Revised:** 20- Feb- 2022, Manuscript No. jcmp-22-