

SCIENCE AND RELIGION
GRADED PAPER 2 REVIEWS
TIM WHITE

Paper 1

A thorough review, but like your other review, the organizational structure is not ideal. You do, however, highlight the fundamental weaknesses of this paper's poorly defined thesis and meandering arguments. Your writing remains too informal, but communicates the key issues well enough.

Grade: A-

Paper 2

Your organization doesn't help you here. You've read the paper carefully, but in responding in a paragraph-by-paragraph manner, you focus on the more superficial aspects of the arguments presented. Moreover, you require the original author to do more work in finding the common themes across paragraphs that speak to the higher-level concepts of the paper. Your commentary on those higher-level concepts is somewhat weak, since there are much deeper objections that you could have voiced.

Also, your writing is far too informal. Worse, it is often severely ungrammatical, leaving some sentences difficult to interpret.

(1) No, it's not a logical contradiction at all. It is an objection, and it may even be a compelling argument against Gosse, but there is no *logical* issue presented.

(2) You've encountered a difficult and compelling part of this paper, but your objections to it are superficial. Dig deeper in your reading and your critique. There's much more that you could have said here, and it would have helped the author.

Grade: B

Review #1

Reading The Fine Print: Finding Connections Between Science and Christianity

Paragraph I

As an overall view of the paragraph it is very choppy and almost difficult to understand. Some of the sentences are poorly organized and could be stated in an easier manner. You spend a lot of time classifying what science does and in comparison what religion does which is good that you are laying a basis for your argument but, you lack a strong like one or two sentence thesis that is supposed to state what you are going to prove. You could be more concise, stop beating around the bus and state what you want to say. ✓

- ❖ The first sentence is not a very engaging one make it something that will catch the readers attention and will make them want to read the essay. Also your thesis is that the do agree and coexist so you should watch what you say.
- ❖ The second I don't think is even a sentence; it is a fragment of one.
- ❖ In the fourth sentence try to find a synonym for unanswerable.
- ❖ Up to his point there are a lot of very choppy and short sentences add some more complex sentences.
- ❖ The seventh sentence portrays a very strong concept; make sure to keep it in.
- ❖ "Science was inevitable," what do you mean by this it is a little random and I am not sure what your point is. ✓
- ❖ The last sentence is very vague you need to explain it more.

Paragraph II

Here I assume is you thesis. Good thesis but still vague, expand it more to say exactly what you are going to prove and how you are going to prove it. The thesis should also be located in the first paragraph, not on its own in the middle of nowhere. Really on the whole I am not sure what you are going to prove in this essay, what exactly are you responding to.

Paragraph III

On the whole this is a good paragraph, it basically takes the entire first paragraph and condenses it into one. The only thing to watch out for is that the third sentence should be more specific and say science casts a larger net the what?

Paragraph IV

Again this paragraph is very bland, what point are you trying to make? There is a lot of fluff in this essay, find specific proofs. The last sentence of this paragraph would be better suited as the first one they should be switched. The first sentence is also not a good sentence, you should reword it. ✓

Paragraph V

There should be no “however,” in the first sentence you are not comparing it to anything just stating a fact. The third sentence should be reworded to make it easier to understand, it is a bit of a run on. The church did not really decree its power because it was absolute it decreed its power absolute the church was not absolute the power was. Watch the grammar in the 6th sentence, it is a good concept but poorly written, for example start it with “It was only after...” The last sentence also needs to be reworded. In this paragraph some very large concepts are brought up with little proof. Research and add more specific examples to make your argument stronger. You seriously lack specific examples.

Paragraph VI

This paragraph finally gets into the meat of the essay. Good job bringing up the specific example of the Roman Empire and its conflict with religion. But you need to related it more to sciences conflict wit religion, your first topic sentence says how science and religion are similar and that they get into many conflicts because of that but this paragraph dos nothing to explain that. How does the Roman Empire represent science and their conflict? This example is a good one but you need to relate it more readily to the conflict between science and religion.

Paragraph VII

This paragraph and the last one make up the meat of the essay good examples, but it is bad that it is taking this long to get into your main points, I should have been aware of them a little earlier in you essay. In the second sentence the word also is out of place. This paragraph uses good specific example and these two paragraph combined are very strong. Make sure to keep these examples and ideas; the most important thing to work on here is grammar.

Paragraph VII

In the second sentence, what “goes to show?” What explains there are so many sects of science and the church? I am not sure I really understand this paragraph. You need to clarify what you are saying here

Paragraph VIII and IX

Very interesting point you bring up here but you need to prove it more you just leave it hanging. I like this paragraph; maybe you should present this with earlier paragraphs. These two paragraph could almost be more incorporated into your thesis to make it more clear and comprehensible. This is really what your thesis is present it earlier.

Paragraph X

Solid closing. A little away from the entire point of your essay, so maybe you should reword it a bit but a good wrap up on the whole. One last comment on the whole essay that can really be scene in this paragraph I feel like you are trying to force in stuff we learned in class a little too much and not using it well. In general use more examples but don't force them, maybe do a little outside research.

Review #2
A Disparate Synthesis

Paragraph I

In your first paragraph you are stating two different things. It is clear that your thesis is that science and religion can find a disparate synthesis but then why do you say in the sentence before that, that they must be separated. Synthesis is not a separation. Also the use of the word "fundamentally" is excessive, as the professor was saying in class they could just be different questions. Good introduction to the topic with the use of Gosse's ideas though definitely keep that.

Too informal

Paragraph II

Nothing really stands out to me in this paragraph, it is really just a statement of fact. There are no real grammar or other errors.

→
so

Paragraph III

what?

This is a serious flaw with the Gosse argument; the only problem with your argument comes from the scientist relying on observable data. If God put the data there it is still observable, the data still exists, if it *appears* to be it is observable. More of the flaw science finds with the argument is that it takes away from the legitimacy of science not so much the scientific method. Experiments can still be underwent it is just that the outcome is fake not false.

grammar

Good point

Paragraph IV

I don't think this is two logical contradictions; it is one serious logical contradiction. I also think that this can be more easily exemplified by the use of Occam's Razor. This basically is what you are saying, maybe you should address that. The thing with address the flaws of Gosse's argument is that they are pretty obvious, the theory is obviously flawed, you shouldn't spend so much time on it. I am also not sure how this address your thesis so much, it kind of strays from your point.

①

grammar

Paragraph V

This paragraph is also very solid and hard to argue with, but again my point is that it is relatively easy to prove Gosse is wrong and that, this argument and is very similar to the one presented in the last paragraph. You could probably manage to combine the two last paragraph.

Paragraph VI

So up to this point and still through this point you are disproving that science and religion could coexist, but in your thesis you say that there could be a synthesis. Other than this the paragraph make complete logical sense and the grammar is good.

Paragraph VII

You need to explain this example a little more. I am not sure how this exemplifies the inconsistencies with the Bible. I believe it does but I am not sure how.

Paragraph VIII

Why does it have to be a “fundamental” revision? Other than that I have nothing other to say.

Paragraph IX

You state it yourself the rejection of the Gosse hypothesis is simple, so why spend so much time refuting it. This paragraph is like the start of a whole new essay. You begin a whole new thesis and bring about totally new ideas. It is not really coherent with the previous parts of your essay. This would be a very good introduction but sitting in the middle of this essay it is a little out of place, it is basically a whole new essay.

repetitive

Paragraph X

This is truly your thesis this should be presented in the beginning of your essay, but other than that it is a very solid thesis. Starting this whole new idea so late in the essay leaves you with an insufficient amount of time to explain it very in depth. Less time should be spent on Gosse and more on this new idea.

Paragraph XI

2 | You are right this would be a difficult and slow process. The biggest flaw I find in this paragraph is when you say that a religious person may become an atheist in the sense on science. This may be taking it too far. This statement is very flawed. A religious person really can't become an atheist, I think it would be easier to say that they could just stay away from one another but not become an atheist.

Paragraph XII

Here you go back to the Gosse synthesis. I think it would be more interesting if you just stuck more with the fact that science and religion could coexist. You should not focus so much on Gosse your other thesis is much more interesting. Overall your style and grammar is very good, but your topic for most of the essay is well proven but not so interesting.

✓