

Essay 3  
Review 1

Overall:

Very well written, with seemingly few mechanical/grammatical errors. Your arguments are logical and well supported. For what you are arguing you cite useful examples and do a very good job of using those examples to your advantage. The paper is a little long but there is some things that you could cut out or at least shorten, but overall very good.

Paragraph I:

You have a good introduction into your topic and do an excellent job of giving the reader a background of the information. Your thesis is clear and therefore overall this paragraph does a good job as an introduction to this paper.

Paragraph II:

Here is where I notice that you use very long drawn out sentences. Sometimes it is more effective to shorten the sentences and make two of them. For example the third sentence is very long and drawn out with excessive comma use, think about making it two sentences. I agree with this first paragraph sometimes truth is clear and can be readily observed. Just remember though at one point the Earth was unquestionably thought to be flat and that to question that was crazy, also still today there does exist a flat earth society. (Just something to think about)

Paragraph III:

This paragraph does sound reasonable and well thought out. The only thing is that again remember at one point all paradigms seem like they are the ultimate truth. It is only when a flaw is found can we then in retrospect say that something was wrong. As long as we cannot observe something as fact there is always questioning that can be done.

Paragraph IV:

This is where the paper gets into the real meaty argument. The idea that something that is not definite can be assumed to be truth. There many times in the past that scientist thought there accepted theory was the end all be all of everything but this was not the case. We cannot predict truth until it is certain. There are still flaws and unexplainable phenomenon under the phenotype theory, which still leaves room for a Kuhnian revolution no matter how unlikely it may seem. As long as there is still some phenomenon there is room for Kuhnian progress. For an interesting look at the genotype and how it may not be all truth look at the new york times article from Monday.

Paragraph V:

No major problems here, it is a good conclusion to the paper. The only thing I would mention is to watch out that you don't get into anything too new/ that you don't introduce any new ideas that are left unexplained. For example the end of the paragraph is almost a cliff hanger maybe you should just not mention those things and let the paper end.