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# Critical Thinking Activity #2

For my extended material I watched the Bill Nye versus Ken Ham debate on evolution. The material seemed very fitting aligning with the video lectures and also the debate of different scientific method strategies.

## List the Primary Claim

In the 2 hour and 45 minute presentation there are several claims that were made by the two participants. Bill Nye argued that the natural laws of science are constant and therefore the world must be millions of years old. He also asserted that creationism is not a viable model. Ken Ham that evolution was right, except there was not a single primordial ooze. Instead he argues that there are numerous initial animals that then evolved.

## List all of the Evidence

Ham presented that the world is only 6,000 years old, and discussed numerous inaccuracies in historical science. For instance he submitted the same sample to different labs to perform different dating technologies. The responses ranged from 40k years ago to 2.3m years ago.

He also explained that the problem with evolution is that it “hijacks” the term science, though ambiguity. What it means is observable science does not directly co-inside with historical science. However we just call both “science” which bait and switches the actual argument.

Nye used examples such as the Grand Canyon, drilling ice in the artic, and fossils to explain why the world had to be billions of years old. He then attacked the bible’s stories for being simply stories; there could not have been truth to their claims. The concept of Noah and the great flood was raised.

## Evaluate the Evidence

I was more torn on this argument that I expected going into the lecture. Ham has several good points about how we cannot reliably measure how long ago something occurred in past. Nye made explained how Noah’s arch would not have worked. He also did raised lots of good points about the bible being non-literal text.

## ****Empirical Evidence is based on Observations****

This is one area that was lacking in the presentations by both parties. The only empirical data that they gave was on the age of the world. Nye had more examples such as the sentiment build up at the Grand Canyon.

Both sides used several family tree diagrams to convey their points. While not empirical evidence in the traditional sense, it does serve the same purpose.

## ****Evaluate the Claim****

I agreed with the argument by Nye that the bible was not intended to be taken literally. There are parts that are unlikely to be accurate. Though Ham did a very good job of explaining observational science was being incorrectly taking the place of historical science.

The idea of the “creationism orchard” made a lot of sense compared to the “evolution tree.” Nye discussed molecule-to-man, which takes hold of the idea that we all started as the same goop, then forked off to become different species. Ham describes there being an orchard as there are many species trees, one for birds another for dogs etc. There is not a distinct starting point. In a lot of ways they are describing the same conclusion, the only independent variable is how old the world is.

# Conclusions

This video has raised some very interested ideas and made me consider the ideas of creationism versus evolution. It was insight full especially given the lecture material this week. I think that creationism and evolution are looking at the same evidence, and coming to the same conclusions.

They do disagree on some key issues such as the age of the world, the meaning of the word ‘science,’ and the origin of life. Both sides need to be less literal in the stories passed down. There was no evidence associated with it, and critical thinking needs to occur. The world is likely very old, we don’t know how old but its old. At some point hopefully they learn they’re not so different and live happily ever after.