

Name

Professor

Course

Date

“Others have seen what is and asked why. I have seen what could be and asked why not”, Pablo

Picasso

### **Introduction**

In the process of seeking knowledge from the known and unknown, many people have used differing approaches. What people know or their zeal to pick from what has already been presented to them make explains why there is a significant different in perception of what is presented as knowledge to different people. Typically, people are more likely to ask why things happen rather imposing the ‘why not question’. Others like Pablo Picasso choose to go down a different road and attempt to answer the ‘why not’ question regarding the same occurrences. Thus, people may have different perceptions of the same events. Nonetheless, it is the keywords ‘why’ and ‘others’ in Pablo Picasso’s statement that alter or give its meaning in the most ideal way possible. ‘Others’ in the context of Picasso’s statement referent to other people who have a different orientation of thinking as compared to Picasso himself while ‘why’ an inquisitive term seeking to unravel why things are the way they are and why they tend to appear as presented. Through phrases such as why not, have seen, and ‘what is’ as noted in the Picasso’s statement, he defines what is typically known or presented and the application in the process of knowledge production and development. Specifically, the ‘why not’ phrase has been use by Picasso in his statement to depict the probability of a different affirmations of what has been typically been known to many. Imperial knowledge is well represented in the statement by the ‘why is’ phrase. Thus, it is clear that Picasso discovered that typically, people easily accept the ideas and

interpretation things depending on how they are presenting why they should also challenge themselves to imagine what could be the case if a different approach was used. How far are people willing to agree to what is commonly known in the expense of that is unknown or known to few? This question will ideally be crucial in addressing Picasso's knowledge statement. It is worth noting that the question will be answered with History and Ethics AOK with insight, language, and reason being the major facets of thinking regarding these AOKs.

### **Ethics**

Reason and intuition are key factors that determine the production of knowledge in the field of ethics. Typically, there exists two groups of people differentiated by how they accept knowledge. According to Carlos et al., one group, from an ethics perspective, accepted knowledge as it is presented to them while the other go ahead to imagine the knowledge in instances where it was used to enquire. Scholars in the realm of ethics seek to assess the truth of this statement by unravelling to what degree the perception of what is known by people influences that which is not known. Reason basically determines that which has already been presented to people. To the contrary, perception seeks to determine the usefulness of the adequacy of what is presented and the necessity of making changes. Personally, the area of ethics has taught and enabled me to challenge things that have been presented way of unravelling that which has not been presented as opposed to people who choose to be comfortable with what they are presented with without imagining different circumstance surrounding how the knowledge is presented. Normally, some people gladly make peace with the fact that regulations and rules imposed to them are in line with a specific direction. However, there are those who question why some regulations were disregarded or why they were developed in a certain way. There is a famous policy, for example, by the vegan people which forbids them to eat meat. The vegan population oblige to the policy without question why the policy was developed in the first place and how the consumption of

meat affect health as well. It would not be effective to question why the vegan people are not allowed to eat meat because the people hold their existing knowledge. Knowledge seekers will be beneficiaries of such as quest because they will learn the factors behind the policy and the case if the policy was founded differently. Thus, it is clear that while some people are comfortable asking the 'why' question, others go on to ask try and answer the 'why not question'.

The process of seeking to comprehend why knowledge is in existence in the first place can be somewhat similar to asking the 'why not' question on the same or why a specific approach was used or not used to attain the knowledge. From the ethics area of knowledge, everything is deemed right and correct because it how different people in different societies perceive behaviour or characters that are different. Some things could be negative understood or interpreted by some people. Thus, knowledge that could be right for someone could be different for others? What it means is that if something is agreed upon by different groups of people, it is right regardless of whether questions have been asked about it. Proponents found their argument on the basis that whatever is presented to them is right and shouldn't be questioned. Ethics also affirms that the confusions arise in the process of questioning what is not known because people begin to understand that various circumstance would be bettered if certain approaches were followed. A perfect example is how stealing is treated in the society. Attempting to unravel why stealing is perceived that way is a crime in equal measure as it is an attempt to normalize the act. Moreover, both enquiries will end up justifying why stealing is considered a crime in the society. The role is the same and so are the results. As such, it becomes irrelevant to ask the question because they not only consume valuable time and resources, but also because there is that knowledge and perception that people have held for so long.

## **History**

History is referent to the past. Its primary function is to look aback to the past occurrences

and events and how the events affect the production and development of knowledge. Even majority of the people agree with historical knowledge and how it is presented to them, there is a significant group that goes on to question how the knowledge would have been if varying approaches were used in the past. Nevertheless, as confirmed by (Hoffman, Carrie, and Chuck), the language that was used to develop and put the historical knowledge in records play a key role in determining how knowledge is passed down generations. Historians have found it necessary to use the known to uncover the unknown in the quest to understand the important issues that were not recorded or published by publishers or authored. The essence of language in passing and presenting knowledge regarding the events that unfolded during the First World War determines if there still are questions to be asked. For example, historians can seek to understand if the preceding events could have prevented WW if done differently. Understanding what could have happened if events unfolded differently is instrumental for because learners could end up enriching their knowledge about the occurrence than just agreeing with the information as presented. Seeking to answer the 'why not' question is considered essential than agreeing with the 'why' because it facilitates better production of knowledge. Even though unusual, a substantial number of people go ahead to use what is presented to them to seek more knowledge. They gain more knowledge and understanding.

### **Counterargument**

To counter the claim, even though process of knowledge production does not insinuate that some people have attempted to answer the 'why not' question because the two are simply prompts for more information by those seeking to extend their knowledge. For scholars, asking the 'why' and 'why not' in the process of developing or acquiring knowledge facilitates their understanding of finer details about history as opposed to being comfortable with the mere information presented to them (Marcello et al. 40). When deciding which question should be posed to better

and more adequately explain a definition, the dilemma of resource supply and time wastage has always emerged. Asking the question why is not normally time intensive and most of the explanations in the details given are readily accessible or clarified. In the opposite, posing the question of why would not cause the specialist to delve deeper into what is unclear, which means that a lot of time would be spent attempting to prove that the information was given was not good enough, that if a new path or method was followed, it will be better. In keeping with this, something I witnessed while I was reading about the consequences of the WWII and the beginning of the Cold War is a real-life indication that confirms this counterclaim. Although numerous researchers have clarified much about these two major historical incidents, attempting to understand more about what has been presented without prompting the obscure leads to better knowledge being learned without wasting time. It is not prudent for a person to look for the known, when it is already obvious to any specialist what is presented. This instance counters the argument that asking why not is easier than asking why in the course of gaining knowledge.

### **Conclusion**

As seen in this discussion, there could be varying interpretation of Picasso's statement "Others have seen what is and asked why. I have seen what could be and asked why not". Even though the discussion goes ahead to address some of the different ideas on how the statement is true using some basic example, it solely up to knowers and knowledge seekers to choose what to question and what not question in the process of acquiring knowledge. Lastly, I can use the argument of Pablo to explain how persons from diverse contexts can ask about concerns in order to get the right knowledge or understanding from them.

## About

Our aim is to provide the best assessment help

GET 25% OFF  
ON 1ST ORDER

ORDER  
NOW