Simon Schaffer states in his interview that he believes that to understand science we need to both understand the view of the world that science gives us and how scientists produce a view of the world. This is interesting because historical scientific discovery is portrayed as strokes of lack or coincidence. For example, the story of an apple falling on Isaac Newton's head, or the eureka moment of Archimedes in a bathtub, or the discovery of penicillin. All these things just seem to be flukes and ingenious acts but when we study how science is produced, we learn that these people had a background, that they didn't just come upon these ideas in a day. They had learnt things from their society and others and, particularly in the case of penicillin, might have had many unrecorded accidents and ideas that didn't amount to anything. They had a community that shared similar ideas and with which they could dispute others' opinions. This not only gave them a reason to think about certain things and experiment but also helped them come up with their own ideas. So, when we look at scientific discovery in the context of its era, we can understand why some things were discovered when they were and why some others took longer. For example, Boyle lived in a society that lacked trust and where people died for their beliefs. Therefore, his introduction of open experimentation with witnesses and an invitation for others to replicate the experiments, was fitting for his time. Another example is the development of the computer. During the second world war the computer was viewed as a tool to help with the war, as a result, governments invested in it, which facilitated its development, unlike in Charles Babbage's time when there was very little funding for such things. Now climate change is threatening humanity, leading to a growth in sustainability and environmental scientific research. So, I agree that to understand science we need to understand the context in which it is discovered and developed because this helps us understand the importance of the science and allows us to ask the right questions to be able to improve upon the discoveries of those who came before us.

Daniel Buren believes that the understanding of the process and ideas that prompt the creation of a work of art is lost when the artwork is viewed outside

the studio. Because a museum exhibition lacks the messy background and unfinished, failed experimental artwork that adorns a studio. This is similar to Schaffer’s analogy of the boat in a bottle. The environment or context in which the artwork is in, gives it more meaning and elicits a different emotion and understanding.

Buren's argument that artwork is portrayed in museums as instant perfection, is similar to Schaffer’s observations on how scientists are portrayed as holy beings who make instant ingenious scientific discoveries. In both cases of art and science we see that understanding the process, of how the thing that is came to be, whether it be a scientific discovery or art, changes our perception of the thing itself. What I have grasped from the article and podcast is that background and context play a vital role in how we view and understand things. Whether it be art, science or even people.

The reading shows that what we perceive as art and our understanding of art is defined by what we know of the world. What we see, hear and feel dictates the type of art that we are able to produce as a human race. The introduction of photography made possible what was assumed to be impossible. This in turn led to a new way of thinking for artists, it broadened the definition of art and made inventors also think differently about what is possible too. In the same way that science advanced, for example in medicine, when the notion of germs was introduced, people began to understand the world differently. This led to the development of other technologies such as gloves, face masks and disinfectants. It could be said that even though the art and technology is within us it takes a different thought process, an original type of thinking and viewing of the world to be able to produce something new. I believe that when the world's nations became more multicultural people were introduced to different ways of thinking through interacting with others and this accelerated the advancements in art and science.

Art has been evolving through time, not only in technique as with the introduction of the theory of linear perspective but also in style, presentation and materials utilised. Even what was once deemed to not be art, for example abstract art, is now a major part of the discipline. It can also be said that the purpose of art has also been evolving with time. Starting with cave paintings, whose purpose was to tell a story to the enlightenment and renaissance when paintings were used to record history and for scientific documentation. Which is different from now with the presence of computers, art is used more for pleasure and expression. Within time the value of art has also increased and this increase in value has made some pieces of art to symbolise something greater. For instance, the Lester Codex is worth so much that it is now a symbol of wealth and power.

Early photography using the camera obscura took time and required large equipment to achieve. This meant people had to go to a photographer and pose for pictures as they would have done for a portrait. Even through to the early 90's, access to photography was not that open. For instance, my mother doesn't have a single baby picture of herself because cameras where expensive and a photographer had to be hired to capture family pictures. So, the few family pictures that do exist are posed and rigid. However, now with the advance of phones, everyone has a camera with them all the time. Now the amount of family pictures that we can take are infinite, and with image sharing platforms such as Instagram and Flickr, images can be shared instantly. As a result, photographs are more spontaneous and we are overloaded with pictures online and on our social media, to the extent that, nowadays photographs do not stand out as artwork, in comparison to other forms of art such as paintings. For this reason, artists use technologies such as photoshop and other tools to make images stand out as pieces of art. Some artists even combine paintings and photography. Artistic photography also has to be posed and thought out more to capture people's attention. Its almost like artistic photography has to recede into past photographic practices to be considered art today. However, the wide circulation of pictures and the camera's ability to capture details instantly, does leave us vulnerable to unauthorised surveillance, stalking and snooping since we have our lives online for everyone to see. People are also heavily influenced by what they see, and marketers take advantage of this. Just as Hershman Leeson alluded to in the article when she said, "more and more we are losing control of who we are, and our identity is being virtualised and contaminated...". Through the art of photography and video, advertisers have been able to influence public opinion and set trends.

This week's video has got me thinking of why photography was invented. In the video, Geoffrey Batchen states that the advance of photography began during the romantic era when people looked at the world and wondered how they could capture the moment. I however believe the urge to capture moments began much earlier, way back to the paintings on cave walls. The story of the young woman who paints the outline of her lover's shadow on the wall because she wanted a snapshot, points out one reason for painting and photography: there is a human desire to preserve memories. If we go further back to the beginnings of art, when cavemen drew on walls, we see that people drew to preserve memories and pass on stories that would otherwise be forgotten. This links back to art being a discipline that communicates a particular knowledge of the world, and what it is to be human.

Scientific empiricism can also be said to have had an influence on the creation of photography because it encouraged experimentation and sharing of knowledge that others can replicate and contribute to. So not only was photography essential for the accurate recording of facts and experimental evidence but it also helped facilitate the development of the camera. As discussed in the video, the technologies that the inventors Talbot and Daguerre built their inventions upon, such as the camera obscura and the elements that darken when exposed to light, are technologies that had been observed many years earlier. Talbot's and Daguerre's work further contributed to the invention of the Kodak and all cameras that followed on from there up to the cameras on our mobile phones.

Another thing that the video points out is how a photograph takes a snapshot of the world, and by doing so highlights what the viewer should be paying attention to. This is further expressed in the statement made at the beginning, "How can something that reveals so much, keep so much to itself".

This got me thinking about the difference between photography and paintings. Photography as an art form is about abstracting the unnecessary and highlighting what is important, essentially, we see what a photographer wants us to see, while in a painting we have a glimpse into the painter's imagination, we get to see through the painter's eyes. Photographs are almost deceptive,

framing the scene, creating illusions while at the same time adhering to truth to nature. Therefore, it is much easier to lie with a photograph than it is to do so with a painting. For instance, photographs were once used as proof of hysteria however the symptoms exhibited by the subjects of those images were intentionally created. This deception is even greater in today's world, where images can be digitally manipulated. Therefore, in order for images to be used as evidence, trained judgement is necessary.

A paradigm is a theory or a group of ideas about how something should be done, made, or thought about (Webster, 2021) and epistemology refers to the philosophical study of the nature, origin, and limits of human knowledge, in other words it is the knowledge of understanding (stanfor.edu, 2021).

What I have understood from the article by Donald Preziosi is that despite being surrounded with many objects and artwork, people struggle to accurately interpret and understand art. One reason, that has been pointed out, is that we define the aesthetics in art. This means our view of art is not original as the concepts behind it have already been predefined. However, what we consider to be art and how we view it may vary in different cultures and societies and people's perception of art may be influenced by those who have agendas to push. Therefore, although some art can be interpreted with an understanding of the artist's style or particular aesthetic movement, generally the interpretation of art requires an understanding of the political, religious, economic or social historical context of the art piece. This point is interesting as it supports Simon Schaffer point made in his article on the function of the studio, that artwork does not stand alone. We can also see this when interpreting art using Marxism or similar methodologies.

Secondly the study of art history has been created from the human opinions of what art means and how we perceive ourselves to relate to it. This therefore makes art history unlike any other subject in the humanities, that is except for philosophy. Preziosi further discusses the debate on where the attention of art history should lie. Whether it should be on objects produced within a specific cultural aesthetic tradition or whether art history should focus on all cultural artifacts. There is also the question of who defines art aesthetics and determines what the focus of art should be. This debate is further complicated by the fact that art history is not confined to one domain but is spread out across several institutions that have different concepts of art such as galleries, archives, various cultural commodity marketplaces and various aspects of the tourist and heritage industries, both religious and secular.

Works Cited

stanfor.edu. (2021). *stanford.edu*. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology/

Webster, M. (2021). *merriam-webster.com*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/paradigm

This week's reading made me think about the forgotten histories, such as those kingdoms that died out without any record of their existence; and the lost historic art, such as all the artwork, books and monuments that have been destroyed either in wars such as the second world war, or by dictators such as chairman Mau or by people who wished to omit it from history. These destructions and omissions are not only a loss of beautiful arts and histories, but they also dilute the significance of certain events in history such as slavery and make it harder for future generations to completely understand their pasts'. What I like about the National Museum for African American History and Culture, is that it tries to showcase what has been omitted even if it is painful to see. We are therefore able to view history through the lens of those who were oppressed and by doing so we see that there is more depth to their cultures and contributions to the world.

The reading also highlights the significance of art as a way of showcasing history, culture, and religion. For instance, the national memorial for peace and justice is a piece of artwork that expresses the suffering that slaves went through better than any words could do. In addition, the technology of photography has also played a major role in capturing history as it was. As mentioned by Majeed, photographs are evidence of omissions. Slavery, war, and holocausts cannot be wiped from history when there is photographic evidence of it having happened. It is important that history be preserved, good and bad, because just as art makes us, so too does history. With an understanding of history and art we are able to build better communities that can work together to advance the human race.