

## REVIEW #1

Your first two paragraphs (including the thesis) are clear and well organized. The biggest problems arise from individual sentences with awkward phrases. Consider changing phrases like “the nature of this truth is not consistent between the two” to something more concise (you could use one word to replace the second half of this sentence). In the second paragraph, your claim that “the clash between science and religion is most evident when a scientific hypothesis conflicts with religion doctrine” states the obvious. The last sentence of the second paragraph is confusing in its wording. Perhaps a different sentence structure that does not suspend the contradiction would clarify your point. When introducing an author for the first time in the body of your paper, use his first name as well as his last. Russels’ “underlying premise,” you say, is correct, although you disagreed with part of the quotation. You need to specify which part of the quotation is his underlying premise though.

On the second page, you state that “Disproving any of these fundamental beliefs would cause the entire religion to disintegrate,” and your next four sentences then state the same point in slightly different wording. Your argument would improve if you cut out the unnecessary sentences. I also don’t what you mean by “Multiple causes can be attributed plausibly to the same outcome, upon initial observation.” Causes are not attributed to outcomes (they produce them), and your prepositional phrase should either begin your sentence or not be separated with a comma at the end.

On the top of the third page, you mention the possibility of “applying religion to all that is currently unknown.” This suggestion seems to contradict your previous claim that

religious truths are unchangeable. As the knowns and unknowns change through scientific discovery, wouldn't that in effect change religious truths too?

At the end of this paragraph, you mention a gap between science and religion, which ideally, is an interesting idea, but you should define it when you introduce it. The only elaboration you give is that religious truths need a starting point. I don't see how the creation of a "gap" would follow. It is a hard concept to grasp with such sparse information. In addition, you should also state outright: "This could never work because...", because otherwise, the reader is left trying to figure out how this gap would work, but then you just move on. You also say this gap will leave a number of "unknowns temporarily unresolved." An unknown is, by definition, unresolved.

Another confusing concept you mention is that "Equating fundamental laws of the universe with God prevents a scientist from even asking whether a more basic explanation could exist, and so this attempt at reconciliation fails." Why? Is the only point of science to find the most basic explanations? Why would a reconciliation fail just because a scientist has accepted a form as "the most basic?" Did Einstein fail as a scientist because he called an explanation "God?"

The last paragraph of that page contains the phrase "irrevocably irreconcilable," which is redundant. A few sentences later, you state that as they stand, science and religion can "quite comfortably coexist." I am not convinced. Think about the heliocentricity arguments or the fact that so many people unsuccessfully attempt reconciliation.

Your concluding paragraph should (and does for the most part) wrap up your argument, but you add some new, irrelevant ideas like the fact that you can imagine an

experiment that could evaluate free will in the future. I also don't understand how the very act of this experiment would "question the method by which religious arrives at truth?" You haven't previously mentioned that method. You also say that when science and religion are "diametrically opposed, a religious scientist would be an oxymoron." What about Collins? Are science and religion not diametrically opposed right now? I don't understand which situation you are commenting on.

Almost every sentence in this paper is passive (containing one of the passive verbs: is, are was, were, be, being). I found it slightly distracting, but more importantly, your arguments would come across stronger if you reintroduced the subject into the sentence.

I like the sound of your title, but the idea of religion as a "limiting factor" does not appear in your paper.