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“ There are only two ways in which humankind can produce knowledge: through passive observation or through active experiment.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?   
The argument whether knowledge can be attained through passive observation or active experiment defines the meaning of knowledge. When you look at two people argue, philosophers argue this is passive knowledge of the argument as you are not actively being engaged in the argument. However, as you argue with your friend, this is defined as active knowledge since you are in a position to experience the argument and get to know something out of it. Looking at this statement, it is therefore evident that knowledge can be produced through active experiment or passive observation. Different philosophers have argued different suggesting that knowledge can either be produced through growth. For example, knowledge produced as growth is where two there is an argument from different philosopher in the past and the discussion is given to new philosophers to give their opinion to the argument. This is a new knowledge being created. Both arguments are valid in their own ways. Partially, the argument that knowledge is produced through passive observation or active experiment is true. On the hand, the statement can be disqualified from the account that it disapproved from being limited from other modern day forms of producing knowledge.   
Concluding that knowledge is produced through passive observation or active experiment is partial justification of how knowledge is produced. Knowledge is commonly produced through logical conclusion of event or situation. Logical conclusion can either be through experiencing the event, then coming up with the analysis why or why not something is good for an individual or the society. Following logical conclusion produces knowledge that is mainly aimed towards protecting no evil. For example, we you are actively engaged in a discussion where two parties are disagreeing over immorality, through listening and understanding of the whole argument, one is able to make logical conclusion on why or why not you think is immorality is all about how the people view the way of life.   
Whether you are passively observing an event or actively experiencing an event, you ought to come up with logical conclusion as to why you believe what is right and why something else is wrong. For example, if you are planning to change a toddler’s dipper and immediately before you speak these word “ let’s change your dippers because the Allan needs to remain clean.” Baby Allan is still young to understand your language properly but they are developing knowledge through concluding that you need to change your dippers when you are dirty. This is knowledge produced by a toddler through logical conclusion.   
Science knowledge is also produced through logical conclusion. For example, while trying to understand why when you through a stone it goes up to certain level high but then changes it direction, Isaac Newton was observed the movement of a mango after falling from a tree. He then came up with the finding that gravity determines the movement of the mango. Gravity pulls them down towards the location where gravity is higher than the other direction where gravity is limited. This is partially passive observation. But in order to produce the knowledge about gravity, Isaac Newton needed to come with different reasoning as to why the mango did not go up to the sky but instead fell to the ground. Through logic, he then came with the effect of gravity on movement of object from one direction to another.   
Today, when you look at a plane flying over the space, one may develop several arguments as to what makes the plane to be suspended at the air and still be able to move from one location to another. However, in order to come up with the final analysis, you will need to partially use your passive observation and logical understanding in order to explaining the theory behind a plane being to move from one location to another in the air. That is, you will need to observe, use knowledge about what you know about gravity, and the technology require in order controlling gravity and other added knowledge. All this is mainly based on logical understanding and logical conclusion in order to come up with a theory of why plane can be suspended in the air. In my own opinion, as you observe a situation or event, you must reason with the event or situation based on what you know. This logical conclusion used to produce knowledge.   
In a political discussion, knowledge is produced as a result of our different ways of seeing things. This is partially passive observation where the way you look at a discussion helps you to produce the needed knowledge to solve a problem. However, the much needed knowledge is arrived as a result of logical analysis of a problem in order to come up with logical explanation that offers a solution to an existing problem. This statement seems to suggest that knowledge is produced as a result of passive observation. For knowledge to be produced through passive observation in this situation, objective perspectivesm ought to be involved. For knowledge to be produced through active perspectivesm, subjective perspectivesm ought to be involved. However, if in either scenarios objective perspectivesm or subject perspectivesm is not involved, then we can conclude that knowledge was produced as a result of logical analysis leading to logical conclusion.   
Knowledge that is produced with objective perspectivesm being involved is defined as knowledge where one observe a situation, has an idea about how to go in such a situation but keeps the knowledge to himself. This knowledge produced but not shared. As for knowledge produced with subjective perspectivesm being involved requires one to observe a situation, plays a role in helping solve the current situation and learns something out of that situation. There is knowledge being produced and knowledge being shared at the same time. Immanuel Kant states that knowledge production requires either objective perspectivesm or subject perspectivesm to be involved.   
Looking at the idea of producing knowledge, we can state that knowledge is produced as a result of organic perspective where intelligence requires practical and logic for knowledge to be constructed. Knowledge requires growth for more knowledge to be produced. The sole reason of knowledge is practical application where one has knowledge but for his or her knowledge to be produced, he or she needs practical application to make his or her concept valid. Considering that knowledge is a way of seeing things, we also require applying what we see and how we see in to practical for knowledge to be produced. For example, looking at knowledge as how people view events of situations then they apply what they know in this situation suggest that knowledge is produced when it is applied. Look at this scenario, Kevin, knows that to write a book, one has to develop his ideas in a systematic manner that will keeps his readers interested. For Kevin to write a book on how to attract the reader’s attention in a book, he will need to apply what they know and keep his readers interested in writing. If he managed to do exactly as he says, then we will say that knowledge is produced when it is applied.   
In conclusion, the argument that knowledge is produced through passive observation or active experiment is partially true. Passive observation is more like objective perspectivesm where you are indirectly involved with the action or event happening. On the other hand, Knowledge is commonly produced through logical conclusion of event or situation. Logical conclusion can either be through experiencing the event, then coming up with the analysis why or why not something is good for an individual or the society.   
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