



IB TOK ESSAY SAMPLE



WRITING
METIER

TITLE



ARE WE TOO QUICK TO THINK THAT
THE NEWEST EVIDENCE IS ALWAYS
THE STRONGEST?

GET HELP WITH
IB TOK ESSAY
AT OUR WEBSITE:



WRITINGMETIER.COM

During the knowledge acquisition process, when we want to learn something, we see the newest proof as the most reliable, like a lighthouse of truth in a world that changes quickly. The main question of this essay is, "Are we too quick to think that the newest evidence is always the strongest?" Looking closely at history and natural science, we can see how complicated this assumption is and find out where our knowledge claims come from.

In a time of constant growth, when new technologies are changing the way we think, the question becomes more important and makes us think about how we feel about the unknown. This essay argues that even though new information is appealing, it needs to be carefully looked at before it is taken as gospel. Natural science and history are used as examples to show that the strength of proof isn't just based on how recent it is; it's also based on methodological rigor, contextual relevance, and how foundational principles interact.

It will look into natural science and history, which have their methods and ways of moving through time. In natural science, we break down how the scientific process, empirical inquiry, and the temporality of evidence work together. At the same time, studying history reveals how difficult it is to understand the past and how modern views can change how strong proof is seen or understood. This investigation aims to show that the strength of evidence comes from many different factors.

Natural science

There is a common claim in natural science stating that in natural science, the newest data is automatically more substantial because the scientific method is iterative and technology is improving. As scientific knowledge grows, each new piece of proof improves and refines what we already know, making it more complete and accurate. Innovations in technology, high-tech tools, and enhanced methods help produce more accurate and trustworthy data. As a result, the newest evidence in natural science is thought to be stronger. We can now watch, measure, and interpret things better.

In the area of climate science and the study of climate change¹, there is a great example that supports the idea that new evidence is always more robust in natural science. In the last few decades, improvements in climate modeling, sensor technology, and data collection methods have made it much easier to understand how Earth's climate works.

In the past few years, satellite-based observations have given scientists a level of depth and accuracy that has never been seen before when tracking things like sea surface temperatures,

¹ United Nations. "What Is Climate Change?" United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, www.un.org/en/climatechange/what-is-climate-change.

carbon dioxide levels in the air, and patterns of ice melt. High-performance computers run advanced climate models that use much data to simulate how different parts of the climate system interact.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) puts out assessment reports on climate change every so often. These reports include the latest scientific research on the topic. The new information in these reports comes from a variety of different sources. They add to global policy talks and efforts to lessen the effects of climate change.

In this case, the claim is that the newest proof about climate change, which comes from advanced satellite technologies and complex climate models, gives us a more accurate and complete picture of the problem. The latest data and methods for climate science are always being improved, which adds to the strength of the proof that shapes our understanding of one of the most critical problems the world is facing.

In response to the claim, a counterargument says that the temporal strength of data in natural science depends on more than just how recent it is. It also depends on how long-lasting basic principles are. Although many ideas and principles were created long ago, they are still used today and are the basis of scientific knowledge. A scientific theory or idea's age sometimes makes it less valid; the fact that some basic ideas are still practical after all these years shows how solid scientific evidence is. This way of thinking says that the strength of proof over time isn't just based on how recent it is but also on how long-lasting and reliable basic scientific principles are.

A strong example of the counterargument that supports it can be found in classical mechanics and everyday engineering uses. This example shows how strong basic ideas are in natural science.

For example, the statics and mechanics ideas that Sir Isaac Newton developed hundreds of years ago are fundamental when making bridges and buildings. The concepts of equilibrium and Newton's laws of motion² are essential for designing and building structures. Even though modern engineering uses complex tools and technologies, Newtonian physics still holds and ensures that these structures are safe and sound.

Structural engineers use Newtonian principles to determine how loads are distributed in buildings and bridges and how much energy is acting on them. These ideas have been around for a long time, which shows that they are reliable and can be used in the future. Although

² "Newton's Laws of Motion." Encyclopedia Britannica, www.britannica.com/science/Newtons-laws-of-motion

materials science and computer programs have come a long way, Newtonian physics' basic rules are still used to ensure that structures are stable and safe. This shows how strong basic scientific knowledge is over time.

This example supports the counterargument by showing that in some areas of natural science, the fact that basic ideas have been around for a long time makes them more valid; they are still used to guide and teach modern scientific and engineering practices.

History

In the field of history, the claim says that the newest historical evidence is naturally more substantial because historical methods are continuously being improved, new sources are always becoming available, and people's views are constantly changing. As technology improves and archives are opened to the public, historians can find papers and points of view that were previously hidden. This helps them get a more complete and accurate picture of past events. The newer historical proof is more robust and gives a more comprehensive and up-to-date picture of the past.

One example is the study of the American Civil Rights Movement³. Voices and points of view that were once on the outside have been found and included thanks to technological progress and a more significant push for inclusion in society.

Recently, oral history projects, digitization efforts, and opening files closed to the public have made it easier for historians to access a broader range of first-hand sources. These sources contain first-person accounts from people at the head of the Civil Rights Movement but whose stories were often left out or ignored in earlier accounts. Digital tools and platforms have made it easier to keep these stories alive and share them with others. This has helped us learn more about the movement's struggles and successes.

Also, modern historians who use techniques from different fields and constantly changing methods give us new information about the historical background of the Civil Rights Movement. Their studies are better because historical methods are improving, which helps make this critical time in American history more correct and complete.

This example shows how new historical data, made possible by improvements in technology and methods, helps us understand the past better, especially by capturing different voices and points of view that might have been missed in earlier accounts.

³ "Civil Rights Movement." History.com, www.history.com/topics/black-history/civil-rights-movement.

Contrary to the claim, a counterargument posits that the temporal strength of historical evidence is not solely dependent on recency but also the enduring significance and contextual relevance of foundational historical documents. Some primary sources and historical accounts, rooted in the past, provide essential insights into understanding historical events. The age of a historical document does not necessarily diminish its strength; instead, the enduring value of specific foundational sources emphasizes the continued importance of historical artifacts and documents in shaping our understanding of the past. In this view, the temporal strength of historical evidence is not exclusively tied to its recency but also to the enduring significance and reliability of foundational historical sources.

This is one of the oldest and most complete written law codes. Hammurabi⁴ wrote it in the 18th century BCE. Even though it is ancient, this historical record is still used to help us understand how ancient Mesopotamia's laws and society worked. There are moral and ethical ideals from that time in the code's rules, which can also be used to understand how justice was done.

Even though a lot of time has passed since the time of Hammurabi, historians and other scholars still believe this old set of laws is essential. The rules in the Code of Hammurabi give us a timeless look into how people lived, worked, and followed the law in an old society. The fact that the document is ancient doesn't make it less valuable; it shows how vital primary sources are for shaping our understanding of ancient cultures.

This example shows that some historical documents, although very old, are still helpful for learning about the past. This goes against the idea that the strength of historical proof depends only on how recent it is.

Our research of natural science and history has revealed a complicated interplay of temporal dynamics in whether the most recent data is always the strongest. As we decoded each area, it became clear that evidence's vigor is not merely tied to recency but rather to a complex tapestry of elements.

The examples from natural science showed how recent evidence shapes our worldview. The counterpoint, reflected in Newtonian physics in structural engineering, informed us that certain underlying concepts remain steadfast, strengthening scientific understanding. The assertion applauded the growth of historical methodology, uncovering missed narratives, particularly in the American Civil Rights Movement. The rebuttal emphasized the timeless relevance of ancient manuscripts like the Code of Hammurabi, emphasising that historical proof is more substantial than temporal closeness.

⁴ "Hammurabi." Encyclopedia Britannica, www.britannica.com/biography/Hammurabi.

Our research shows that knowledge acquisition is dynamic. A balanced mix of chronological, contextual, and lasting aspects makes evidence powerful. Thus, the search for knowledge navigates a terrain where time's ebb and flow enriches and strengthens our understanding, encouraging us to take a holistic view that transcends the latest facts.

References:

United Nations. "What Is Climate Change?" United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, www.un.org/en/climatechange/what-is-climate-change.

"Newton's Laws of Motion." Encyclopedia Britannica, www.britannica.com/science/Newtons-laws-of-motion

"Civil Rights Movement." History.com, www.history.com/topics/black-history/civil-rights-movement.

"Hammurabi." Encyclopedia Britannica, www.britannica.com/biography/Hammurabi.