

Can purely scientific and religious views of the world be reconciled?

Paper Review

1. **Thesis identification:** “While there are many arguments that place science and religion at odds, a religious scientist is not a contradiction. Instead a religious scientist is an explorer of the natural world presented in God’s universe in a way that reconciles scientific and religious views to attain a more complete view of life.” Good Idea. I think it is possible for you to say this in about half of the words. The second sentence could use some clarification...especially the phrase “the natural world presented in God’s universe.”
2. **Quality of arguments. Beginning → end?:** The point you are trying to prove in this paper is that a religious scientist is not a contradiction. Although I think you make several great steps towards this, I was not entirely convinced by the end of the paper. However, if you clarify the intent of each paragraph and each sentence, I think you will easily reach that goal.
3. **Allow speculation... appropriate?:** Your paper falls under the third topic (can a scientist be religious?...) and focuses more directly upon the question, “Is a scientist who believes in god failing to apply scientific thinking to some parts of the natural world?” Your paper topic choice is obviously appropriate. However, there are some comments you make in this paper that need backing up (and thus may be deemed inappropriate). At the top of the third page you write, “But according to the Bible, even God makes mistakes, feels threatened by mankind’s power, “blots out” human life with the great flood, and then continues to create fear in men to control their behavior.” These things are said with no actual proof

behind them, and unfortunately “according to the Bible” does not suffice. Adding in proof (a quote, maybe?) will make the paper more scientific while at the same time giving your point a more solid background.

- 4. Larger structure. Discontinuities?:** The structure of this paper is good, but it is a little mushy. I know that doesn't make sense, but hear me out. There is a lot of extra information that softens your argument. If and when you remove the mush... this will be a much more scientific paper.
- 5. Terms defined before use?:** The only issue I have with this (as is explained in no. 6) is that the explanation of the visible light spectrum is not clear enough for someone who does not have any previous knowledge on the subject.
- 6. Comment on language. Concise? Excess modifiers?:** this paper needs to be more concise. There are too many commas and excess phrases that do not add to the message of the paper and often confuse the reader. There were many sentences that I had to read over two or three times to understand. The second paragraph had a lot of sentences like this. The first sentence took me two or three times to understand because of its awkward wording. When you explain why the sky was blue because of the visible light spectrum, you do not organize your point in a clear enough way. People who do not already know the reason why the sky is blue (i.e. me) did not get a scientific enough reason. I know that the information was in there, but it was difficult to weed out.
- 7. Sentences: intent clear?:** this part of my critique follows naturally after the previous point. Some of your sentences contain so many ideas that the reader becomes lost in all of the words. An example of this is in the first sentence of the

third paragraph: “A question that follows from understanding that a scientist who believes in God is failing to apply scientific thinking on this subject is whether this is important.” There are several problems with this. Primary among them is that it begins with “a question” and does not end with a question mark or pose an obvious question. The intent of this sentence is really unclear to me.

- 8. Clear transitions?:** One thing you do well on this paper is transition. Each of your new paragraphs has to do with the previous one, but at the same time has something new to say.
- 9. Correct word usages?:** The only comment I have here is to watch out for the difference between “complement” (to complete) and “compliment” (i.e. your hair looks nice today)
- 10. Too informal?:** Your arguments are formal and appropriate, but the delivery is more informal. Once you restructure your sentences and remove the extra words, the formality will increase.
- 11. Mechanics:** Overall your mechanics are pretty good, but I would watch out for using too many commas, because that could get you into trouble as well as befuddle your arguments. (I am a hypocrite for saying that in a sentence with two commas)
- 12. Appearance:** It looks good overall. One problem I have is the title. It is very casual. It could be written in a much more assertive way.

Overall you did a great job! With a few touch-ups, this will be an amazing paper!

