

SCIENCE AND RELIGION
GRADED PAPER 2 REVIEWS
MICHAEL NG

Paper 1

A good, thorough, well structured, thoughtful review. Good.

Grade: A

Paper 2

In valuable ways, this review is a good one. Your criticisms—both on the writing and on the content—are insightful and frankly stated. You clearly break down your review, paragraph by paragraph, in outline form, thus providing the author with an easily accessible format. This review gives valuable feedback that should help this author.

However, your writing is, in place, informal sentence fragments. Writing in complete, proper sentences would make this review easier to receive and process. More substantially, you provide feedback on specifics, but you never provide the author a high-level view of the overall paper. You've clearly read and understood the arguments well, but you fail to point out the weaknesses with the overall proposition and its weak supporting parts. Moreover, there are additional problems with the writing mechanics that deserved to be highlighted.

In short, that which you did review, you reviewed well; unfortunately, you were not thorough.

Grade: B+

Paper 1

Introduction:

- It is clear what you are trying to prove to the reader

Body paragraph 1:

- "How could God intentionally deceive mankind in such a manner?" There are legitimate arguments about why God would do that, such as testing the faith of His followers. You may not need that sentence. ✓

- "The notion of a 'trickster God' seemed antithetical to the image of God as an all-powerful, omnipotent being." The notion of a trickster God does not contradict His omnipotence; He still has the power to do what He wants. Rather, this type of deception undermines God's benevolence. ✓

- "where Gosse failed in his synthetic attempt." Synthetic is not the right word here. I know what you are trying to say, but "synthesis" does not turn into synthetic as an adjective. ✓

- I agree that the undesirability of Gosse's synthesis was largely responsible for its poor reception. Perhaps, however, part of the reason was due to how there was no evidence to support such a theory? People need to be compelled to believe, and the mere proposition of a logical theory without convincing arguments won't sway devout followers of science or religion.

Body Paragraph 2:

- The discovery of human and dinosaur prints together is hardly proof of your claim. It may be so, but from the evidence provided I am not convinced. If the foundation of the argument is shaky, then the whole example has little to no credibility. ✓

- "If God created all the earth and all the animals in it, then he must have created dinosaurs along with man." Why must this be so? Are you trying to say that God created all forms of life on this planet at the same time? If so, what evidence besides the Bible points to this conclusion? There is much science that directly conflicts with this assertion, such as evolution. ✓✓

- "the existence of dinosaur fossils is seen as antithetical to the word of God." A brief description of why would be helpful for the reader.

Body Paragraph 3:

- I don't see how this example makes sense. The Bible was written far after the extinction of dinosaurs. Surely, the coexistence of humans and dinosaurs at the time the Bible was written is completely illogical. How could the authors reference an animal that they have never seen? It wasn't until long after the publication of the Bible did we even have the ✓

technology to virtually reconstruct fossils in order to hypothesize about the shape and functions of dinosaurs.

- Do these animals really have to exist specifically as they are mentioned in the Bible? Couldn't hyperbole account for the descriptions of these referenced animals? ✓

Conclusion:

-What about those people who do believe that the Word of God must be taken literally? Doesn't your synthesis, which involves reinterpretation of the Bible, insult those Christians?

-In your introduction you said "is still possible through the careful reinterpretation of Scripture and of scientific discovery." You did not reinterpret any scientific discovery; rather, you used scientific discovery to reinterpret the Word of God. ✓

Overall Comments

-I agree that the Bible must be interpreted. Genesis blatantly contradicts itself in the creation story. ✓

- Gosse's theory tried to reconcile the differences between all of science and religion. Your example of dinosaurs merely sets out to resolve one tiny controversy within this arena.

- I feel as if you maybe took on too much in your essay. You have formulated a whole new theory, which takes much more than a 4 page paper to explain.

- Some of your sentences are very long and too wordy. Try to be more concise to increase clarity. ✓

Paper 2

Introduction

How so?

Like what?

- Your definition of determinism is confusing. Use a standard definition. Be sure to include that all events, including human choices, are the *inevitable* result of previous events. / good.

- It is clear what your paper is about

Write in full, grammatical, punctuated prose.

Body Paragraph 1

- Just because determinism is theoretical doesn't make it untrue ✓

Body Paragraph 2

- "to-the-Book" should be "by-the-book"
- It seems that the orthodox vs. the casual Christian in your example is differentiated by amount of education about their religion. You are saying that the casual Christian can accept determinism simply because he does not know his own faith well enough in order to find contradictions.

Body Paragraph 3

number

- What about the vast ~~amount~~ of Christians who interpret the Bible rather than take each passage literally?

Body Paragraph 5 (conclusion)

- If God is determining what will happen, then is that really any more of free will than the scientific doctrine of determinism?

- Asking about when people go against their gut feelings and then not answering the question discredits all you've said about how God determines what you do by means of those feelings.

Overall Comments

- Titles of books when typing should be in italics, not underlined ✓
- Use of "..." is not grammatical. In all cases within the paper, you should use either nothing at all or a comma where appropriate. ✓
- Your points were very clear and well-organized. I had no trouble understanding your argument, although I'm not sure I agree that God determining things is really any less fatal to the notion of free will. ✓