

## Review of Paper 1

### Faith and Epistemic Principles: Why Religious Belief Should Seem Unreasonable to Scientists

- I. Thesis
  - The thesis is very clear and easily understandable.
  - From what I understand, the thesis states that a scientist cannot hold religious views because the scientific principles with which he was inculcated with will not allow him to acknowledge the existence of a God since God is not a scientifically provable entity.
- II. Quality of Argument/Logic
  - In the first paragraph of the last page, the argument that there are certain things that are principally unfalsifiable is not an acceptable statement since there is always the possibility that certain things are simply just waiting to be proven. In the course of time, there are numerous theories and concepts that will gain scientific approval. For example, years ago, a cure for cancer was seen as an impossibility. Although it may seem unlikely that God is not scientifically provable, there is still the possibility that proof of God will *one day* be found. That possibility shouldn't be ruled out.
  - The concluding paragraph touches on the fact that a scientist is not required to hold these scientific principles in their private as well as professional lives but then dismisses this point. Just because a scientist's professional life requires him or her to hold certain principles in esteem does not mean that they need to carry this part of their job into their private lives as well.
- III. Acknowledgement of Speculation
  - The paper does a good job on acknowledging speculation. For example, in the introductory paragraph, stating that it is "not reasonable" rather than saying "unreasonable." This is a subtle, but effective, distinction.
- IV. Flow
  - The paper is well-organized, easy to follow, and has a simple and clear structure.
- V. Terms & concepts defined
  - Terms and concepts are well defined, such as the word 'epistemic' and 'parsimony.' These definitions are fairly easy for the reader to comprehend and are a great aid to a comprehensive reading of the paper.
- VI. Language
  - I would delete the comma in the first sentence of the paper so that it reads: "Many scientists believe in God and some are even practicing Christians." If you included the comma for dramatic effect, you could always replace 'and' with a semicolon or with the word 'while.'

- In the second sentence of the introductory paragraph, the word 'scientists' should be changed to the singular 'scientist.'
- In then concluding paragraph, the word "intuitions" should really be changed to the singular "intuition."
- Second paragraph of the first page: Although the principle is referred to as Occam's Razor, it is named after William of Ockham and not Occam.
- The last word of the paper, 'absurd,' creates an emotionally charged tone that casts doubt on the rest of your conclusion so I might consider revision of that choice of diction.

VII. Tone

- The tone of paper concerns me in that it is repellant to the average reader. Your paper seems to emulate Kuhn's style of writing in some ways. The tone is condescending and that is never good because it gives the impression that you are talking down to the reader, which will cause him or her to immediately disregard many of arguments, even if they are well-crafted and logical.