

## Paper #2

### Inevitable Changing of Church Doctrines

Title should be more interesting and specific to your paper and thesis. It is unclear within the paper itself whether you think church doctrines do change. For example, in the introductory paragraph, you state: "It may seem that Christians change their doctrines to conform to the conflicting views of science, but these discoveries help create new interpretations of scripture..." Your paper shouldn't contradict its own title.

The introduction was unclear and didn't tell me the focus of your paper directly. It would help to define things such as what about "our understanding of the natural world" changes, which "doctrines of the church" it is "inevitably forced to adapt and change," and what "differences in certain doctrines" you are talking about. Avoid using language such as "in stating this" and "it may seem." You refer to the "geocentric model of the universe" as a "notion of science" but later say that it is a Christian doctrine and a fault of both Christianity and science. Please clarify your views on the geocentric model. Thesis: "It may seem that Christians change their doctrines just to conform to the conflicting views of science..."? Make your thesis clearer and more developed.

The "contradiction between the church doctrine and scientific evidence" needs to be clarified. What was the scientific evidence? It would help to state the religious and scientific bases for the geocentric theory and how it was overturned. Also, clarify the scripture you are referring to and what it says- Explain: why did scripture originally lead them to believe in geocentrism? How can it be looked at in a new perspective to accommodate scientific theory? Also, avoid useless adjectives such as "numerous" and "plentiful."

In the third paragraph, it is a good point that religion has confirmation bias, in that they take things to mean what they want rather than in the real context of the scripture, but your argument could be a lot stronger. It would be better to use an example that actually has to do with religious doctrines and scientific discovery. Your example supporting this argument seems unrelated to your thesis, and it is not clear how it connects to the conclusion you want to draw from it. What about the "context of the scripture" makes it "obvious" that these "interpretations are not what the verse was intended to suggest"? There isn't a clear connection between this example and how it "proves that honest mistakes in taking scripture out of context can provide alternative implications." Be more specific about which church doctrine you are referring to—the geocentric theory, church doctrines in general, etc. It is unclear whether you are trying to say that scripture shouldn't be interpreted literally or that the definition of scripture was formerly misinterpreted.

In the fourth paragraph, your argument needs to be much more specific and based in fact. Wasn't the start of the geocentric theory derived from religious texts and backed up by religious texts and the scriptures? Explain how scientists proved the

geocentric theory to be true and “came to the formation of this principle,” explain how religion adopted the idea from science, and how science eventually overturned the belief. It is unclear what point you are trying to make by saying that “all science was not put to shame or deemed ‘unbelievable.’” Are you trying to say that it should have been? Or draw a conclusion about religion being “put to shame” without enough reason? Also, you say that in science, people “believe all things in that area to be true,” but many people within the scientific community have varying viewpoints and most scientific discoveries are not referred to as fact but as “theories” and “hypotheses.” This paragraph also does nothing to prove your concluding statements of it- are you stating that they are both at fault? Say what you mean.

In the fifth paragraph, you need to define what you mean by the “Christian Doctrine.” It is unclear whether you are referring to general Christian beliefs, a specific belief, or the same doctrine you discussed earlier. “This is one of inevitable scientific evidence deals with the logical contradictions of animals” doesn’t make sense and needs to be reworded. Discuss why the gathering of animals on the arc “logically does not make sense in the scientific eye.” The argument that the scientific and religious viewpoints don’t conflict on this does not make sense; scientists wouldn’t take “latching onto other animals” or “divine intervention” as a logical solution. Last sentence does not make sense and the argument that it is irrefutable is unconvincing.

In the sixth paragraph, it would be extremely helpful to have an example of an instance “where neither side is wrong nor right.” Clarify what power religious leaders had, how they were losing it, and examples of their reluctance to change. Also explain what doctrines which church said you had to believe in to avoid damnation and connect the idea to show how they “give a bad image for the reliability of the doctrines.” Also, it is unclear whether you are saying there is no “scriptural evidence” for the “certain doctrines” or that you will be condemned if you don’t follow them.

In the last paragraph, your statement that “The issue becomes whether or not that church deserves to be criticized for false or misleading doctrines” is off topic from your thesis, and you should try not to introduce new problems in your concluding paragraph. Explain how science says, “that beliefs cannot evolve and learn from previous experiences” and who these “scientists” are that “say that the change in the doctrines were only due to science” ...use examples. You need to define this “argument that only science is true” before you attempt to draw conclusions disproving it. You also need to define these “original doctrines” and which “scientific probabilities” you are referring to. Fix “cannot be disprove that it would not happen”- too many negatives. You need to explain how “arguments like that of Noah’s ark” were attempted to “be used to diminish the Christian doctrine” before you can refute it. You show no examples of Christian doctrines that “remain true even if there is an evolution”, and there is no clarity how these Christian doctrines change and remain the same. Also, you say that “there is nothing that proves that

Christian doctrines cannot change and yet still be true," when throughout history, Christian doctrines have been blatantly overturned by scientific evidence. Are you trying to say that Christianity is still true and misinterpretations of the past don't change the religion?

Overall, this paper is rather vague and doesn't flow, and the argument is unclear and unpersuasive. Many sentences and phrases are awkwardly worded and unclear. A lot of rearranging and rewording would help you to get your point across much more clearly. There are also a lot of grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors throughout that can easily be fixed- omission of commas, fragments, etc. It doesn't give you a real sense of focus on a thesis, and individual paragraphs need to state their conclusions and points more directly. Also, many key terms essential to understand the meaning of this paper are left undefined throughout- such as Christian doctrines. Many of your points and refutations would be more convincing if they were backed up by factual information and appropriate examples, because right now they are weak and the way they are presented seems hypocritical. It appears as though you are either unsure of what your major points are or that you just are not stating them directly, which is hurting the strength of your argument. In the second paragraph, a lot of the language is not formal enough and there are a lot of grammar/ spelling errors. Many sentences should be reworded to sound less awkward and read more fluidly- maybe add some better transitions.