

Review: "The Impossible Reconciliation of Observable Evidence and Blind Faith"
Paper 1

General Comments:

1. Watch formatting. There are exclamation points on the top and bottom right of each page and a # sign in the middle bottom. I think they should be page numbers.
2. Watch spacing between paragraphs. It looks like some paragraphs have a space and a half between them.
3. Parenthetical statements are overused. They should be kept to a minimum and eliminated if possible.
4. Make sure that there is only one space after each period. I cannot tell for sure, but it looks like there might be two spaces after some sentences.
5. In the paper you avoid addressing how science has actually been able to refute many claims that Christianity has made over the years (like the age of the earth). You say that science and religion cannot be combined, yet over the years they have overlapped a lot in how they explain the world. You should make the case for why overlapping is not the same as being combined. I think this is one of the strongest points on the other side and should be addressed.
6. Overall, you drive at a point well and have a clear goal in the paper. This is good. There is also good development and organization.

Paragraph Comments:

Paragraph 1 (Page 1):

1. I would insert "have to" after "constantly" and before "defend" in the first sentence. It is not wrong as it is, I just think that "have to" makes it closer to the sentiment you are trying for.
2. I would use a different word instead of "planted" in the third sentence.
3. About halfway through the introduction, change "that science observes" to "scientific observations."
4. The long parenthetical part in the introduction is unbalanced (by not offering a similar statement in the following sentence about religion) and does not belong in the introduction. I would either cut it or move it (cutting is probably better).
5. Watch your tense in the third to last sentence in the paragraph. "Lost" does not match the present tense used in "attaches" and "claims."
6. The thesis at the end of the paragraph is good and clear. Keep it.
7. The introduction is a little bit long. Eliminating the lengthy parenthetical statement will help, but consider looking it over once more and seeing if there is any excess fat that can be trimmed.

Paragraph 2 (Page 1 &2):

1. Insert ", one of whom is blind," (with commas) after "starving men" in the second sentence of the paragraph. Later in the sentence eliminate "one of the men is blind" and put a period after desert.

2. You should eliminate or rephrase the line “This example shows nothing about which man was right, and a metaphorical reading of this situation says nothing about either science or religion.” This undermines your point, especially the latter half, which contradicts the following sentences that go to explain the metaphorical meaning of this story.
3. In the story you tell us what the blind man represents but not what the seeing man represents, even though it may be obvious. You might consider adding “(representing science)” after “seeing man” in the sentence beginning “Perhaps.”
4. The sentence beginning “Yet perhaps” is perhaps unnecessary. Don’t we assume that the blind man had no idea about whether a car would come because he is blind? It is not necessary to eliminate this sentence, but consider its redundancy.
5. There is no comma after “Yet perhaps”.
6. Quote marks are overused throughout the paragraph and the paper. Orphan quotes (for example on the word proofs in the late/middle of the second paragraph) mean very little and add very little and should be avoided if possible.
7. The parenthetical statement “(just as science cannot produce proofs)” seems awkward and poorly phrased.
8. “Both men ascertained the arrival of help” seems awkward to me, but it could be fine.
9. The latter half of the aforementioned sentence is good.
10. In the final sentence of the paragraph, “either” should be replaced with “them” and the word “its” is ambiguous. Which definition does this contradict? Perhaps both? If so plural should be used.

Paragraph 3 (Page 2):

1. Citations are good. Make sure to include a bibliography.
2. In the sentence beginning “For the purpose” you say, “we will assume...” In general assuming is not good, especially if you are taking someone else’s conclusion for granted. I would caution against, but the point seems central to the paper. Perhaps change it to a word with less negative connotation, “adopt” or “employ” might make it come off better.
3. Eliminate “in fact” in that same sentence. It is superfluous.
4. In the next sentence, beginning with “Currently,” you state a claim that I feel is unsubstantiated. Science has made progress in disproving old Christian doctrines (i.e. the age of the earth). What is a standstill? What do you mean by “not proven anything one way or another”? Is this just concerning God or all of Christian thought?
5. In the final sentence of the paragraph, “notwithstanding” is one word and remove “either.”
6. Also, the final sentence seems more like it belongs in the next paragraph. Especially the “lose-lose” situation bit is out of place and had me asking where that came from (you have yet to make that point, though you do later).

Paragraph 4 (Page 3):

1. This page is relatively good.

2. The word “Let’s” at the beginning of the paragraph is very colloquial, consider revising. Also, contractions are discouraged.
3. What does it mean to “disprove... immortality”? This is what you state in the first sentence. I feel that science has already done that, perhaps pick another word that better conveys your meaning.
4. In the next sentence you say “the battle of science and religion.” I would change “of” to “between” demonstrating the fact that it is a “battle.”
5. The word “Evangelist” implies a preacher. I think “Evangelical” would be more appropriate.
6. The sentence beginning “Science is” states that the quote is from the Collins interview (in parentheses) and also says that Collins said it (at the end of the sentence). This is redundant.
7. In the next sentence you say that “science is a child of religion.” Really? I feel like you made a big claim with little to no support.

Paragraph 5 (Page 3):

1. You say in the parenthetical statement that: “Science is the other method able to assess the validity of the Christian doctrines.” What is the first method (other than science)?
2. Change “this case” to “the case” in the beginning of the last sentence of the paragraph. Also, eliminate the parentheses in the sentence (but keep what is in them) and add “of” after “case” to make the sentence work.

Paragraph 6 (Page 3 & 4):

1. The paragraph’s final sentence beginning with “However” could be said more clearly. Consider revising, perhaps breaking it into two sentences. As is, it is unclear.

Paragraph 7 (Page 4):

1. In the second sentence of the paragraph refers to “religious guidelines” and “scientific guidelines.” It is unclear what these “guidelines” are. Perhaps specify or use a more explicit word/phrase.
2. Eliminate “In my opinion” that begins the next sentence. It is repetitive since you are writing the paper and we assume that everything that you write is your opinion.
3. The following sentence states that “blind faith and observable proof cannot coexist.” Why not? Why can’t someone have blind faith in some things and rely on observable proof for others? I think you are referring to when the two overlap they cannot coexist, but this should be clearer.
4. You say, “Gosse’s synthesis is an *attempt*...” Be careful about asserting what Gosse’s motives were. It is unclear that your assertion of his motives is correct. Either rewording or a citation is necessary.
5. In the sentence beginning “Science,” you say that that science explains the earth “as well as” Christianity. Be careful about asserting a hierarchy. What if science explains the earth better than Christianity? Or visa-versa? To what aspects do you refer? Perhaps just state that they both attempt to explain the earth without asserting if one does a better job or if they do an equal job.
6. In the third to last sentence, at the end, insert “a” before “draw.”

7. The second to last sentence brings up an entirely new point that doesn't entirely pertain to your argument. It is way out of the blue. I would eliminate the whole sentence.
8. The paper ends well.