

The arts deal in the essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The arts deal in the particular, the individual and the personal while the sciences deal in the general, the universal and the collective. " To what extent does this statement obscure the nature of both areas of knowledge?

The arts became a necessity only after physiological, safety, social and self esteem needs had been fulfilled by an individual. It is said that " the arts are a way of expressing emotion". Thus, it is separated from science, in which everything is objective and emotion free. It is said that the arts deal in the individual and the personal.

This is true to a certain extent. Artists (musicians, painters, photographers) express their own emotions through their work. The audience/spectators interpret the meaning of the art form in their own particular way. The idea that each person everyone should have their say, that " beauty is in the eye of the beholder", does not cause anyone to question everyone else's views, when it comes to art. Therefore everyone believes in his/her version of the " truth". This can be seen in Leonardo da Vinci's painting, the " Mona Lisa".

No one can tell why the background of the painting slants from her right, or why Leonardo painted it(x ray scans confirm this) over the features of a man (it hasn't been verified if the man is Leonardo himself). Many people have different theories, but at the end of the day, they will all be right because Leonardo never left anything which could explain his true intentions. This theory would be limited, however, if he was alive and/or left something behind which would explain the curious nature of the painting. The arts are said to deal in the particular. This is almost always true.

The world is divided in terms of culture, religion and language, in spite of technology and globalization trying to bridge gaps. The way something is viewed in one part of the world is almost never viewed in the same way in another. Thus, it is obvious that art that is related to culture and religion in one part of the world can never be interpreted in the same way in another part of the world. A very good example of art involving religion can be the Buddhas of Bamiyan in Afghanistan. The Buddhas were obviously a religious symbol to the Buddhists living in Afghanistan. They were carved in the 6th century.

However, the Buddhist populations decreased and the country was gradually taken over by the Taliban. To them, the statues did not convey any religious meaning, and they were incapable of understanding why it was important to the millions of Buddhists around the world. They (the Taliban) were incapable of interpreting what the statues meant. The statues were destroyed, even though it was possible that the government could prosper from the tourists visiting the site. The Taliban found art involving statues (images of people) insulting, and proceeded to destroy them. However, there are anomalies to this rule as well.

A famous example is Picasso's Guernica, which depicts the killings caused by the fascists in Spain. The painting represents violence and mindless killing. Its meaning is interpreted in the same way throughout the world. Science is based on the "scientific method" which itself is made up of observation, reason and experiment. It has two branches, the natural sciences (physics, chemistry, etc.) and the social sciences (psychology, economics, etc). As it deals with facts obtained from reasoning, observation and reasoning, it has

little space for emotions, which is where it differs greatly with the arts, where emotion counts for everything.

The sciences are said to deal in the general and collective. This means they apply to people from all over the world. This is shown by Darwin's theory of evolution, in which he states that all human beings, regardless of race, have common ancestor- monkeys. Science can never be proven to be right.

Theories in science can only be disproven through the scientific method.

Darwin's theory of evolution is only right as long as someone can disprove it.

However, chances are the new theory will be generalized yet again. And yet, there are some things in science that cannot be generalized.

The most common example in this case is gravity. The Earth is shaped like an orange, which means some places are closer to the centre and some places are further away. The force of gravity is greater the closer a place is to the centre of the Earth. Thus, gravity is one of those things that cannot be generalized. The sciences are said to be universal. This means that scientific theories apply to places all over the universe. This is shown by Newton's Second Law, where he mentions that every action has an equal and opposite reaction (there are some specifications in this law, which are too long be mentioned in this essay).

According to Newton, this law is not confined to Earth, but applies to all reaches of space. Thus, as far as this theory is concerned, science is universal. However, there are some things in science that have not been proven to be universal. The most common example what we call life. Life itself is not universal in science, as scientists have still been unable to prove

that there is life in space. There are rumours, no doubt, of aliens in outer space, but this needs to be proven by the scientific method. If this remains so, the very study of biology can be classified as something that is not universal.

So far, scientists have only been able to prove that there is life on a tiny planet in the Milky Way. The rest of the universe is lifeless, it seems.

Therefore, because of this certain anomaly, science, like the arts, deal in the particular (in this case, a particular planet in a particular galaxy). Tory lane madalene marie Thus from the aforementioned claims, justifications, counter claims and personal examples, I feel that both the arts and the sciences deal in the particular, the general, the individual, the universal, the personal and the collective. Saying anything otherwise can obscure the nature of both Areas of Knowledge.

Source