

Only dali's work  
remains a memorial  
of surrealism.

[Art & Culture](#), [Artists](#)



Only knowledge that has withstood criticism is considered robust.

The falsification principle states that “ for any hypothesis to have credence, it must be inherently disprovable before it can become accepted as a scientific hypothesis or theory. ” Karl Popper’s theory is, by far, considered one of the most prevalent critic of psychoanalysis. He claims that psychoanalysis cannot be considered a science because its “ so-called predictions are not predictions of overt behavior but of hidden psychological states. This is why they are so untestable.

” Despite being unfalsifiable, Freudian Psychoanalytic Theory is widely familiar today. It was continuously rejected and adulterated, yet Sigmund Freud kindled a revolution in psychoanalysis. Furthermore, robustness of Freudian’s Psychoanalytic Theory has been maintained. Several examples in the discipline of Arts have withstood criticism as well. Arts has evolved throughout centuries. For instance, if there was not agreement or disagreement in arts, nothing would have been different and spontaneous. Irrespective of all the disapproval, Salvador Dali’s work has withstood challenges and criticism through time. His work was ridiculed by other surrealist’s who failed to grasp his impression of Surrealism.

Although Dali was expelled from the surrealist community, he constantly created more realistic works and evolved throughout his career. By the end, Dali’s work remains a memorial of Surrealism. Mario Klingemann’s work is another example of creative knowledge production. Klingemann makes art autonomously using artificial intelligence such as algorithms and data. He

says that " these new forms always have a hard time being accepted by the establishment.

" The process behind his work stretches the limits of imagination and has raised questions amongst viewers and artists on how neural networks can be considered art. Yet, Klingemann believes that all art work have gradually earned their place over the past decades. Thus far, we must also consider the view that robust knowledge does not require criticism to evolve, but rather a change in perspective. Besides, consensus and disagreement does not always hinder robust knowledge. A possible reason is of human beings natural tendency to discover new opportunities. The influence of our upbringing, predefined knowledge and situational factors changes our perspectives.

Since our beliefs constantly alters along with the changes in our society, we may perceive our surrounding differently. Similarly, in the AOK of The Arts, our sense-perception about what constitutes art may revolve around our confirmation bias. To some, almost anything can be considered art whilst others adhere to strict rules. The Arts does not have limitations of shared knowledge, but rather the tendency to give preference to things that confirms our prior beliefs. Moreover, the ability to distinguish between terms as hypothesis, falsification and theory is an essential understanding for scientists and psychologist. Which, as a matter of fact, could be unclear for laymen as the use of such terms may differ in our conversational context.

These scientific terminologies are the basis of robust knowledge in sciences that revolves around our sense-perception on the meaning behind the usage

<https://assignbuster.com/only-dalis-work-remains-a-memorial-of-surrealism/>

of specific terms. Coming back to the words of Teal Swan, disagreement is part of the human sciences and The Arts as without it, " progress" would not occur. Her statement implies that disagreement leads to the discovery and development of knowledge. For instance, disagreement between psychologists have motivated them to strengthen their initial knowledge.

Without it, initial knowledge have terminated instead of improving. The Arts have shown the development of new ideas through people's perception. Whether a piece of art would continue or halt depends on pupils level of consensus and disagreement. Conclusively, scientific question, open-mindedness and people's perception leads to consensus and disagreement.

I reckon that to a certain extent, the claim can be debatable. Indeed, both consensus and disagreement is vital in the process of refining knowledge and that criticism eventually produces robust knowledge. Since knowledge is only produced through being falsified and proven, the areas of knowledge of Human Science and The Arts do therefore lead me to the conclusion that robust knowledge requires consensus and disagreement.