

SCIENCE AND RELIGION
GRADED PAPER 2 REVIEWS
EJ MITCHELL

Paper 1

This review is well structured, well written, and reveals a thoughtful reading of the original paper. Nice work.

Grade: A

Paper 2

A thorough and well structured review, but you missed the big flaws. Many of the claims made by this author are grand, likely untrue, and completely unjustified. That lack of justification undermines the entire content of the paper. This flaw, more than any other, is the one that you needed to highlight for this author.

Grade: B+

Title: The title gives the reader a clear idea of what issue paper will address. With that said, "Disparate" may not be the most appropriate modifier for synthesis. Is Gosse's synthesis disparate or is it the ideals/perspectives of science and religion?

W.C.

Thesis: Wasn't the goal of scientists and religious to answer the question of the age of the Earth? If that is the case, how are they answering fundamentally different questions? If the case is that Gosse's synthesis answered more than one question by using both science and religion, you should make that clear, as well as determine what questions science and religion are answering. Also, you assert that for synthesis to be made, science and religion must be separated. Is it possible for synthesis to occur if they are separated?

Thesis Support/Argument: Your thesis and supporting argument assert that Gosse's synthesis was rejected by both the scientific and religious communities. You provide ample explanation for their rejections; however, when addressing the issue of reconciliation, you assert that reconciliation of the scientific and religious perspectives is only attainable through separation. This seems to be contradictory to the idea of synthesis and reconciliation. How can you reconcile or synthesize two disparate views by isolating them? This may be an issue to consider in revision.

Mechanics/Specific Quotations to Consider Addressing:

General Notes:

- Overall, the paper is written very well. I would consider reviewing some of the grammatical questions and diction issues raised below.
 - o The terminology you use for Gosse's synthesis often changes (synthesis, theory, argument, and hypothesis). Is this intentional?

Page One:

- "In 1857 Phillip Gosse published his life's defining work: *Omphalos: An Attempt to Untie the Geological Knot* (Roizen)."
 - o Grammatically, I am not sure if the colon after work is the appropriate punctuation mark. Although a minor detail, it may be something to consider.
- This synthesis creates what some call a "false history," where everything appears (from a scientific standpoint) to have a history that it did not have (Slifkin 164).
 - o There are inconsistent verb tenses here.
- Consider recasting the transition from the last two sentences of the second paragraph into the first sentence of the third paragraph. The transition between your stating of Gosse's theory and the explanation of why the scientific and religious communities rejected is slightly abrupt.
- "Thus, any attempt by science to discover about the history of the earth would be made obsolete."
 - o The construction "to discover about the history" is unclear.

Page Two:

- The first paragraph states that there are "two logical contradictions" that the Gosse theory creates. You may consider making clearer that this paragraph comments on the

first of these contradictions, as the second paragraph clearly states that it will comment of the second. This will make it easier for the reader to know where your explanation of each contradiction begins and ends.

- "If this premise is taken down to the specific example of God's creation of Adam, the argument becomes inconsistent."
 - o What is meant by "taken down"?
- "The idea one's life experiences may be false was a concept that humanity viscerally rejected, which hindered the acceptance of the Gosse theory (Russell 70)"
 - o By "humanity" do you mean the human race or just the scientific and religious communities as suggested by your introductory paragraph?
 - o This sentence has no ending punctuation.

Page Three:

- Another minor detail, you may consider checking the rules for colons
 - o "Though science will continue to advance and discover new truths, religion may be able to assert authority where its greatest strength lies: spirituality."
- "Thus, in order for a synthesis to be made, science and religion must be kept separate – science to deal with testable theories, religion to deal with spiritual and moral matters."
 - o By definition of synthesis, is this statement plausible if you assert that "science and religion must be kept separate"?
 - o It is not clear if the use of infinitives is appropriate. It appears that these may be elliptical constructions, but was that your intention?

Page Four:

- "Though difficult and slow, acceptance of the disparate synthesis may be inevitable. Just as the Church accepted the idea of antipodes, it might eventually have to accept all others that science proves beyond a reasonable doubt (White)."
 - o You asserted earlier that if Gosse's synthesis were accepted "any attempt by science to discover about the history of the earth would be made obsolete." If that is the case, how can science "prove beyond a reasonable doubt" Gosse's synthesis?
- "A religious person, therefore, becomes no different than an atheist on questions of science and only differs in her source of spiritual guidance."
 - o Do you mean to imply that this religious person is a female? Again, another minor detail, but nonetheless it's an issue of gender neutrality that you may consider addressing.

Title: The title suggests ^{WC} the religion benefits religion, but doesn't provide context.

Huh?

Thesis: ^{WC} Party because of the length of your introductory paragraph and the inconsistent fluidity between sentences, it is difficult to pinpoint your thesis.

Thesis Support/Argument: It appears that your thesis is that science and religion can coexist because they positively affect one another. Although a potentially valid point, your examples, which ^{are times} repetitive, fail to persuade. It is unapparent whether or not your thesis effectively answers the prompt at hand. Consequently, it is difficult to follow the logic of your argument. Consider omitting sentences that are not essential to or concise in establishing your argument. ✓

Mechanics/Specific Quotations to Consider Addressing:

General Notes:

- There are many instances in which you quote an external source, however there are no citations. ✓
- Stylistically, the sentence structure of this paper is inconsistent in so far as providing clear transition as well as directly stating your point(s). Consider incorporating more sentence variation to increase the fluidity and persuasive elements of your arguments.
 - o Also, there are many sentences that are run-on or forcibly conjoined. Consider recasting them to provide clarity.
- Some grammatical corrections are, for the sake of simplicity, done in **RED** font in brackets.
- You raise many potentially valid points, yet theirs is little explanation or analysis that connect them to your thesis or the prompt.

Page One:

- “;it lays the groundwork for the mutualistic relationship of two of the greatest ideals of all time.”
 - o On what basis are you able to make the claim that science and religion are the two greatest ideals of all time?
- “This essay will prove that science and religion can and in fact should work together.”
 - o Consider setting “and in fact should” off with commas to avoid confusion
- “It needs some guidance when it comes to the natural world and must accept the ideas that science has to offer.”
 - o Why?
- “Neither science nor religion should exist ignorant of one another, because as Einstein pointed out without one another both are flawed.”

Why the change of font?

- This sentence would probably work more effectively if you recast it as two separate sentences. The use of the comma and conjunction-adverb combination forces the synthesis of sentence that doesn't flow well.
- "A scientist can be religious and in fact should be because when science does not take into account religion it forgoes its conscience, which leaves out an awareness of right and wrong."
 - Consider recasting this sentence. Contains similar awkwardness of previous quotation.

Page Two:

- "Forty percent of all working scientist claim to be believers, therefore it is possible for a scientist to be religious."
 - Is this a legitimate claim? What do you mean by believers? To what extent do they believe?
 - "Scientist" should be plural.
- "Specifically look at two of science[‘s] great[est:] Francis Collins, the man who mapped the human genome, and Albert Einstein."
 - Instead of "look at", try using "consider the" as the reader cannot *actually* "look at" Collins and Einstein.
 - Were your intentions to use a nonessential phrase to modify Collins and not Einstein? If so, you are implying that the reader should be aware of the significance of Einstein and why he should be considered one of "science's greatest".
- "One of his greatest accomplishments, creating a computer that could map genes has led him not discount the existence of God but instead to revere him."
 - Consider recasting.
- "To Collins science is restricted to a standard of truth, for example a collection of atoms; it takes a leap of faith to show that there is some meaning or purpose to everything."
 - It is unclear how this statement relates to issue raised in your introductory paragraph.
- "Albert Einstein who was regarded by many to be one of the greatest physicists of all time was born into a Jewish background and had a "lifelong respect for his Jewish heritage.""
 - There is a nonessential element in this sentence that should be set off in commas.
- "The universe we live in according to Einstein is God[‘s] universe..."

Page Three:

- "Einstein believed that God showed himself in the "harmony of what exists."
 - Can you cite an example?

- “Yes it is very clear from these two examples that a scientist can be religious.”
 - o Is it clear? Although your examples of state that both Francis and Collins are scientist with a set of beliefs, you’ve only discussed the religious aspect; you haven’t explicitly commented on their coexistence in terms of both science *and* religion.
- ““Cosmic religious feeling is the strongest and noblest motive for scientific research,” some of the most motivated scientists in history have been the most religious.”
 - o This is another example of a run-on sentence. Consider recasting as two separate sentences.
- “It is important for a scientist to be religious because religion is a strong motivator.”
 - o In what ways?

Page Four:

- “Einstein wrote a series of essays on science and religion and [t]he interaction between the two...”
- “Knowledge is a remarkable thing to have but it is insufficient in acting as a guide.”
 - o Can this statement stand alone without context? Is it possible to have guidance without knowledge of the matter at hand?