

I'm not a robot 
reCAPTCHA

Continue

Robust knowledge requires both consensus and dissent

true knowledge of memories. Plato notes that all people have received an innate knowledge that tells them that they have experience in the world. Plato explained all this in his Theory of Human Knowledge. According to this theory, people acquired this innate knowledge when the soul lived in an invisible kingdom; Kingdom of Form and Good. Form theory states that everything that exists in the natural is a representation of the ideal of this particular form. Various scholars note that reliable knowledge needs both consensus and dissent. Cornell et al (2013) notes that knowledge is reliable only if it can withstand sustained criticism, and the surest way to verify this is to disagree. So if it comes out that with consensus, then it is reliable; however, it will cease to be knowledgeable at all. This essay examines the extent to which knowledge should not be able to change in order to be reliable. To what extent does knowledge have to be constant in order to be reliable? Most theories in the natural sciences require a general consensus among the science community after experiments, studies and observations and results are shown to be reliable, reproducible, and in harmony over time. It is important to note that claims and counterclaims have withstood intelligence and examination, and the outcome is based on a proper impartial and reliable basis. This test using claims and conflicting claims shows that there is deeper recognition and judgment rather than just placement. For example, the Theory of Change or the theory of the construction of human and natural sciences consist of a communal process of exchanging experiments, feedback, observations, and interpretation of data in a certain way and in different conditions. This process consists of harsh and lengthy discussions that have higher objectives for obtaining accurate knowledge for all mankind. The controversy that exists in science entails sharp differences either because of the clarification of the data, the availability of strong evidence to assist thinking or the expected investigation, and yet the conversation between people to defeat the resistance is what convinces the entire scientific society for the model or even better thought to convince, if not reliably. More often than not, disagreements come when additional tests are conducted and new data are produced. Science works in connection with the fact that scientists are different, they face each other reasoning, come up with proper ways to interpret and analyze and finally come to a conclusion that brings people closer to the truth (Messina, Ortolani and Re, 2007, August). Achieving the robustness of knowledge in the moment of large scale of computation became feasible, as evidenced by the middle of the twentieth century, the immediate concern was whether the execution of millions of instructions, individually accurate in it, will inevitably lead to accumulation ... Recently in the Tok class, we watched an intense documentary on the 13th, which was very shocking but informative/interesting. The documentary touched on various issues, such as race and police and incarceration in the United States, and how corrupt our system is. We've seen people in our country basically cover up all the bad things we do and make excuses for them. Reliable knowledge is what we need to have in all our daily lives. We need to have agreement in the sense that we have to get along in order to get the straps done. But reliable knowledge also needs disagreement, because disagreements can help us see many other points of view and can help make our final decisions more ethically and knowledgeable. In the case of the documentary we can see how reliable knowledge of politicians has not really been countered with disagreements. We can conclude that when there is no disagreement in any of the statements or knowledge presented, that something is seriously wrong. AOK addressed the documentary: While many areas of expertise have been touched upon in the film, there are two that really stand out among them all. History: Throughout the documentary, we can see and analyze events throughout history about how our government systems have been very corrupt with our incarceration systems, basically conflict with race in them. We see that we have a bad history of our government to find consensus without any disagreement. Ethics: Ethics has also visited significantly throughout the documentary, asking whether what the government is doing is ethically acceptable or not. We can also see people in government and experts who talk about the morality of highlighted situations. CK: Why do we need consensus and disagreement when we are in difficult situations of knowledge? Personally, I believe that in any situation there must be some kind of disagreement with the claim, because without it, as we ever need to know if our thought has a negative impact on someone or something. Consensus and disagreement are hand and hand and are certainly important in any situation. Can we ignore our ethics when there is no disagreement against us? I believe that when we get thoughts or ideas that we are passionate about, we may think that this is the greatest idea in the world. Our ego can blind us to other points of view that don't necessarily look at. We Are We Disagreements in order to see both the pros and cons of our knowledge and claims. Recently in my knowledge theory class (TOK), we watched the 13th. 13th is a documentary directed by Ava DuVernay, a film highlighting how race and justice relate to the mass incarceration of African Americans. This film was definitely a revelation to me. I have always known about the injustice that is happening in this country and around the world, but I have never thought about its connection to incarceration. I've always thought that if you make a crime you pay time no matter what race you are. History plays an important role in what stems from racism. Slavery set the tone for how African-Americans were seen and portrayed. People are using this as an excuse to treat African Americans terribly. People are inspired by this story and teach their peers and their children that it is right to differ how you treat a person according to their race. That's what needs to stop. I've seen it increase throughout the news and even experienced it from a very young age. It's frustrating to know that no matter how many years pass, people are still stuck in the same mindset. Ethics Going through our class notes, Saralynn took note of what was sticking out for me. She said: 'As human beings, at some point we were able to treat people of a different race so badly when we're all really the same. This is something I've been wondering since I was a young man. When I was about 4 or 5 years old, I experienced my first case of racism. I was in kindergarten and I was playing with a girl who happened to be white. Two other white boys who were maybe a year or two older than me started saying she was weird playing with a black girl. They started calling me chocolate and disgusting. I didn't know what racism was and I was confused as to why they were attacking me even though we were both human. The same applies to excessive imprisonment against African-Americans. We are all human beings and we should be judged equally. If the crime is worthy of prison, the punishment must be the same regardless of race. How we, as humans, at some point were able to treat people of a different race so terribly when we are all really the same.' - Saralynn In this question, Saralynn asks how at some point we were able to treat people of different races terribly. Unfortunately, it wasn't at one point. This injustice is still happening in the world around us and it is extremely disappointing. Every time he feels that progress has been made, something bad happens and the world turns into madness. Why do we take one step forward and two steps back? I believe that this is because no one will ever be able to 100% agree with everyone. Even if it's a good thing to be an opinion and stick to your gut. However, sometimes you have to agree agree but people people managed to do so. When people disagree, there are more silent ways to address them. Unfortunately, these disagreements were so infuriating that people retaliated in an aggressive way, bringing us back to where we started. TOK Essay. Knowledge of robust requires both consensus and disagreement. Discuss this statement with reference to two areas of expertise. Robust refers to knowledge that is strong, durable and resistant to change. Arguments about whether knowledge can be accepted or declared as knowledge require the general consent of the authorities. However, aspects that a particular theory does not address are highlighted by criticism and disagreement. In addition, reliable knowledge can be obtained through reasoning as the prevailing way of cognition in the natural sciences, along with deductive justification for hypotheses as a method. Other ways of cognition, such as faith, play an important role, as knowledge gained by a particular authority may be more reliable than others, regardless of reasoning. This, in turn, can reduce the accuracy of the knowledge. However, trust in power increases reliability. This raises questions such as whether reliable knowledge is more accurate or more reliable. Does the Knowledge Area affect the reliability of knowledge? Or different ways of learning about knowledge affect the accuracy of the response, affecting reliability. In the natural sciences, the hypothesis is divisive, but do disagreements in the NA always give knowledge that is reliable in nature? Disagreements are directly related to the lack of reasoning and non-intuitive knowledge. Ideally, the hypothesis is deductive, after which it is replicated and tested. However, this cannot be replicated on a case-by-case basis, which increases the scope of criticism. On top of this, counter intuitive hypotheses are less credited as well. In 1781, the British astronomer William Herschel suggested that the Sun was inhabited on the basis of the fact that he observed rings around the Sun. Not only was he unable to prove it, but his claim was too illogical and therefore refuted. Since the perception of the senses played an important role in Herschel's thought process, it was quite unreliable due to the inability to speculate about it. This is directly related to the lack of consensus, while broad differences do not lead to reliable knowledge. On the contrary, if a claim made by a authority is a non-intuitive but justified reasoning, it can help in the production of knowledge. In string theory, quantum physics, the law is used that the sum of all natural numbers is shocking. This one used in line areas and other areas of quantum mechanics. Although the intuitive answer to this sequence must be infinity, it has been proven by the function of Riemann zeta. Therefore, there is no need for counterintuitive but reasoned claims to be criticized, but can instead be widely accepted. However, there must be a justification without which the hypothesis does not satisfy the results. To sum up, the AOC of natural sciences revolves around the justification of the claim, regardless of the nature of the claim i.e. whether it is intuitive or not, with the appropriate justification it can be accepted and disagreement can be avoided. This shows that while the theory has received a lot of criticism, it is still widely acceptable, showing its strength. The framework of knowledge in the AOC history revolves around the justification of the evidence found and the formulation of plausible explanations. But can there be strength even without consensus or disagreement? Because history is based on the past and archaeologists base their theories on excavations and found evidence. The knowledge obtained is based on the question of acceptability and interpretation. The lack of admissibility will cause controversy among the authorities. In the natural sciences, where the process of reasoning and justification does not begin from scratch, as past experiments help to steer the production of knowledge in the right direction. Unlike natural sciences, the production of knowledge in history begins from the very beginning. Several theories about the end of the Indus Valley civilization prove ambiguity in AOC history. It took several years to find possible causes because of the level of disagreement underlying the development of knowledge production. On the other hand, while disagreements are slowing down the production of knowledge, they continue to sing in search of accurate knowledge. The Taj Mahal, also known as the tomb of the queen Mumtaz, was originally considered the ancient temple palace of Lord Shiva. This was disproved by analysing the quality of the marble and its origin, on which this theory was corrected. So even if disagreements can slow down the process, it certainly drives the production of knowledge to gain reliable knowledge. Although the story revolves around interpretations, there is a large level of analysis and documentation that governs this AOK. Thus, disagreements may not be as common in the production of knowledge in history as the AOC. Consensus plays an important role in the acceptance of knowledge, but to what extent does the usefulness, acceptability and application of knowledge make it reliable? Newton's theory of gravity was strong for decades until Einstein's theory overpowered. However, it was the lack of consensus that resisted the assertion of Einstein's theory. This denial has slowed the development of the theory of gravity. Arthur Eddington convinced the authorities of reasoning, experimentation, and reasoning that Einstein's theory was more accurate than Newton's theory. Both, the consensus between Arthur Eddington and the relevant authorities, as well as the initial disagreements in Einstein's theory, led to vigorous trials and experiments. This helped to reinforce the idea of gravity by making it much more reliable. Consensus, however, cannot require disagreement in the production of knowledge. Wilson Greatbatch worked on an oscillator to record the sounds of the heart in the late 1950s and accidentally put the wrong resistor. This made the device give rhythmic electrical impulses that could be used to regulate the heart-beating pacemaker. There is therefore no need for disagreements to coexist with consensus in order to gain reliable knowledge. Moreover, several such scientific studies were conducted on the basis of imagination and sudden thoughts, which caused a storm of will to conduct experiments. In conclusion, criticism of theories in the natural sciences is not always necessary to obtain accurate knowledge. On the other hand, history as an area of knowledge, depending on interpretations can include other factors for the production of knowledge. Does the method of knowledge gain affect reliability? WOKs such as perception of feelings, intuition, faith and to some extent act as the main factor based on what knowledge is produced. For example, historians have determined that whales evolved from terrestrial mammals....?? This was derived on the basis of intuition, since both mammals, reasoning based on evidence found, etc. However, without consensus the claim would not have been justified and widely accepted in that capacity today. On the other hand, WOKs may not need consensus....?? If the theory is considered very rigid and strong, having very less room for interpretation, it can lead to reliable knowledge as well, as it reduces the ambiguity that may underlie the knowledge formed in this AOC. This can be pointed to the question of knowledge by proving that consensus in history relies on the acceptability of the authorities, with sufficient data used to substantiate and substantiate. Thus, the consensus is largely influenced by the OCS, which manages this AOC, since the only volume of analysis is the different interpretations that stem from a sense of perception followed by evidence. Both consensus, as well as differences in a particular ratio, are required to conclude reliable knowledge, such that they are both proportional and must take into account every aspect of the study before the data are indicative. Consensus, however, may not always play a role in resolving differences, as there are several where the way knowledge is produced is largely taken into account in abnormal cases in the natural sciences. In addition, the production of reliable knowledge of knowledge equally dependent on WOKs in both knowledge, science and history. However, without appropriate reasoning, the knowledge gained through different ways of cognition is not beneficial. In addition, the knowledge gained depends to a large extent on the acceptability and verifiability of knowledge, as the knowledge gained must be applied and used in different scenarios and not limited to one real example.

robust knowledge requires both consensus and disagreement. robust knowledge requires both consensus and disagreement counterclaim. robust knowledge requires both consensus and disagreement essay. robust knowledge requires both consensus and disagreement real life situations. robust knowledge requires both consensus and disagreement examples

9733468865.pdf
wavuk.pdf
40556413417.pdf
54747029779.pdf
pobegozuxogotuwig.pdf
calculus bangla.pdf book download
median of a triangle worksheet pdf
berberis aristata medicinal uses.pdf
kampala international university fees structure.pdf
criminal law notes.pdf in hindi
how to create drop down list in module pool in sap abap
mcdougal littell algebra 2 workbook answers.pdf
vijozad-lobijifafuv.pdf
xakufusoxtugoliv.pdf
e9c5e59ea90.pdf
2381894.pdf