

What is knowledge



“ Knowledge is nothing more than the systematic organization of facts. ”
Discuss this statement in relation to two areas of knowledge. There is a natural temptation to assume that knowledge requires distinct capacities due to the fact that we, as humans, are thinkers and doers. When concluding on an issue, we often are guided by our knowledge of truths about the world. By contrast, when we act, we are guided by our knowledge of how to perform various actions.

To say that knowledge is nothing but the systematic organization of facts would mean that whether the knowledge type is theoretical or practical, it will all be obtained the same way. Theoretical derives from the word theory, which is found to be a system of ideas, not facts. This brings up my first knowledge issue of what exactly verifies that a fact is a fact. We as humans use information from what we hear along with what we believe to justify whether or not an issue is a fact or not. We make claims but have no real evidence, just belief. Knowledge itself is obtained by a person through experience or education.

Knowledge can be viewed in many ways based on the 4 different ways of knowing: Language, Perception, Reason, and Emotion. How is one able to tell whether they actually know something or not? My last knowledge issue is that since knowledge is “ nothing more” than a systematic organization, does that make knowledge of the past always certain? Science is based on facts, not opinions or preferences. According to *The Nature of Science*, it is “ a determination of what is most likely to be correct at the current time with the evidence at our disposal.”

It aims for measurable results through testing and analysis. It views knowledge as a systematic enterprise that has the ability to build and organize knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the universe. It also refers to a body of knowledge that is able to be rationally explained and reliably applied. It is viewed as a way of pursuing knowledge and restriction to those types that seek to explain the phenomena's of the material world. The process of science is designed to challenge ideas through research.

It is not meant to prove theories, but rule out alternative explanations until a reasonable conclusion is reached. The term " natural science" is closely associated with the scientific method. The scientific method presents itself as a disciplined way to study the natural world. " The scientific method seeks to explain the events of nature in a reproducible way" (The Nature of Science and the Scientific Method). It produces a thought experiment or hypothesis. Science can also be " a human endeavor and is subject to personal prejudices, misapprehensions, and bias" (The Nature of Science and the Scientific Method).

In natural science, there is much more ways of obtaining knowledge than just research. For example, say that there is someone who has been newly introduced to mechanics and they want to gain knowledge on how an engine works. By reading up on facts about mechanics only helps them obtain half of the knowledge they could possible earn. However, if they were to physically take an actual engine apart piece by piece and learn about the different roles played by each component of the engine, they would

eventually know enough about each part of an engine to put it back together.

I believe for this to be true knowledge for the reason that the mechanic could encounter a different type of engine and use the knowledge gained from assembling the previous engine. The mechanic would eventually use reverse engineering to assemble the foreign engine because engines are nothing more than the sum of its components, meaning that to get to a major conclusion, one must come up with many smaller conclusions to form the big one.

This example not only justifies my thoughts on the quote but also brings up the question of whether or not we as humans can use reverse engineer an economy? What role does memory play in the justification of our beliefs about the past? “ If we assume for the moment that skepticism is wrong, and we do have knowledge of, or at least justified beliefs about, the past, then it is clear, given the different sources of our beliefs about the past just set out, that it is not true that whenever one has knowledge of some past event, one remembers that event” (Epistemology Notes).

Humans observe the development and current status of theories of the organization and representation of conceptual knowledge in the human brain. The brain determines itself what is true and what is not. One has trouble remembering past events of their own lives but do not when it is a past event that is based off of justified beliefs from others. The view of knowledge held by most scientists is the idea of reductionism or materialism. Most scientists believe that all materialistic things can be reduced to their smallest physical particles.

Say for an example, a human mind. Is it possible to reduce it to smaller component parts or physical functions of the brain? If knowledge is simply just the “ systematic organization of facts”, then how exactly would it have the ability to learn through trial and error? If the mind was only a system of organized facts, then it could be easily reverse engineered similar to other engines. The idea of mechanism, which thinks of living things as organic machines, can also be attached to the views of the scientists.