

## Paper 2 Review

### Intelligent Design vs. Evolution

Thesis: I identified your thesis as the following: “Due to flaws in intelligent design, evolution stands as the greater rationalization of life.” This thesis is short and sweet and it makes it clear to the reader that in your paper you are going to explain why evolution is a better explanation for life than intelligent design by given examples of how the theory of intelligent design has holes in it. In the intro paragraph you also hint at some of the examples you will use and you address all of them in the paper which is good.

Overview: overall I thought your paper made great points and flowed nicely. I would suggest adding transition sentences between paragraphs to better flow even more, and some phrases could be reworded. Your use of quotations and embedded question really helped strengthen your paper. Be careful not to overstate your arguments and make untrue assertions. You don't do this very often but you do in a couple instances. Simply choosing less provocative words and changing over all word choice would make the paper sound more credible and make it stronger.

Intro:

- In your Webster definition you might want to consider making that a quote simply because it is from a dictionary.

- When you refer to “God of the gaps theory” it would be more appropriate to address it as a God of the gaps argument, so rewording of that sentence might be necessary.
- Other than those minor things great intro. You make it very clear what your about to argue.

#### Body 1:

- The second sentence of this paragraph, “Still, there are many grey areas that all expertise don’t have a precise answer for.” Is worded awkwardly and you might consider revising it.
- Third sentence, add a comma between “about” and “so”.
- You argue here that the existence of God is disputable. This is a very big claim and it is not something you need to be making in your paper. You are arguing against intelligent design, which Behe does not claim has to be God. God could very well be outside the realm of the natural world and set evolution into motion. God and the intelligent designer you are arguing against aren’t always considered the same thing. I would avoid using God and intelligent designer intermittently.
- The sentence, “And why must the filler must be God or supernatural?” makes no sense at all, probably a typo, but revise that.
- The ending of this paragraph is terrific and I love the quote you used. It plays perfectly into the next paragraph. Well done!

#### Body 2:

- This is by far my favorite paragraph. The only thing I would revisit is the first three sentences from the paragraph, they're somewhat confusing.
- Other than that you explained how science has come up with new solutions to things before deemed insolvable very very well!

#### Body 3:

- I would delete "by and intelligent creator." From the first sentence, it is unnecessary.
- Good use of the embedded question, it is a strong point.
- At the end of the paragraph I would delete "(a change over time to help the species survive)" and "(purposely designed ineffectively)" because you have already mentioned those points about evolution and intelligent design earlier in the paper.

#### Body 4:

- Rework: "These traits make clotting seem to fit into the qualifications of intelligent design, but it doesn't due to the functions and pathways of different portions." Doesn't really make sense and would clear up the paragraph.

#### Concluding Paragraph:

- You say that intelligent design relies on faith and God but again is that really true? Behe doesn't say that "God" was the designer, he claims that something intervened in the evolutionary process to create the irreducibly complex systems we see in nature. That is completely

different than what many people believe God to be. Be careful with that word choice.

- Also I would address the point you made about how evolution is not just a dead end explanation as ID is. Evolution offers room for further exploration and just as science has done in the past, it will, with no doubt, come up with an answer that we now think can't be come up with. That was a great point.

Finally: I thought this was a very well written paper which can be made great by simple revisions and slight rewordings to make this thing really flow. Great work and remember the writing center in your friend ☺.