

EDITING SAMPLE: Please edit by hand the following passage (in non-black ink) and turn in with application. Edits can include, but are not limited to: spellings, punctuation usage, word usage, and style. For help, refer to: www.english.uga.edu/writingcenter/writing

As school children we are taught the theories of Charles Darwin; evolution and survival of the fit. Generally throughout our educational career, we learn to accept the idea that the human beings is the result of a lesser organism once subject to gradual modification over an extended time period. The essence of evolution is that the human being is more progressive than the ape, who is more progressive than the dog, which is more progressive than prokaryotic bacteria. In most cases, contemporary knowledge and scientific research won't dispute this. However, what Darwin's theory is wrong? What if evolution, progression, and the fundamental hierarchies of species did not exist? How would the world be interpreted different? Similarly we can think of the evolution of ideas in the same way. What if an old idea, thought to be obsolete, is proven to be just as valid or more valid than a current idea. Thomas Kuhn, scientist and philosopher, felt that 'progression is in the eyes of the beholder.' He argued that Aristotilian physics is no different from the modern ideas of quantum mechanics and that some same principles once used to guide the construction of the pyramids in ancient egypt are being used today in developing the newest space technology Kuhn writes: "One conceptual world view is replaced with another...we may have to relenquish the notion, explicit or implicit, that changes of paradigm carry scientists and those who learn from them closer and closer to the truth." However, most cannot fathom the idea that the ape is no different than the human, is no different than the dog, is no different than the prokaryotic bacteria. If we were to accept the validity of an older framework, would we be able to understand nature and human interaction in a more normalized, fundamental manner, and essentially create a new scientific paradim? Would old ideas once lost re emerge and help scientistss answer the questions that our current paradigm fails to address?