

Review of “Design of the Gaps”

Thesis: “Consequently, intelligent design has proven to be an unscientific proposition and a formidable obstacle in the effort to espouse scientific ignorance. This should be more clearly stated with what you want to accomplish in your paper: do you want this paper to be a argument of how intelligent design is inferior to evolution or are you merely attacking intelligent design (stating it isn’t a solid enough argument to be believed in)?

Intro: watch your word choice throughout the entire paper. The word evolve (before [1]) isn’t the right word choice because you are automatically going to evolution to describe how life formed which isn’t what people would be thinking if they believed in something besides evolution. Maybe go with “...balanced process come about.” Watch your tone in this paragraph through your word choice and italicized words; instead of “undermines,” maybe use “counters the explanatory...”

1st paragraph: Watch out for sentences that need commas in them; for example, “Subsequent scholars, from Aristotle to Galileo, formed...” and in the next sentence, “...previously believed propositions, such as the four humor and spontaneous generation, were...” This paragraph seems to have no argument against intelligent design in it and is only a background paragraph for the next one to come. Maybe try combining the two paragraphs because it is unclear to the reader why this paragraph is included when there is no evidence to back up your thesis.

2nd paragraph: Intelligent design does not have to be science to give a reason or belief of how life formed. If it is supposedly a scientific theory, then state, “believers in this theory consider it a scientific theory able to rival evolution.” Again, watch comma usage; there are commas before quotes. This paragraph also has a lot of demeaning word

choices, such as destroys, biased, and unsupported. If you are trying to persuade a reader that previously believed in intelligent design, belittling their ideas will make them pissed and not want to believe anything you say anymore. Make sure you are staying on topic and showing why evolution is better and not just attacking intelligent design. Take the passion out of your argument and your argument will appear more reasonable. Also, evolution could also be argued as biased and unsupported since evolution cannot describe the gaps as well (how the earth was created and so forth). To make your argument understandable to all readers and not just those educated in this area, explain what design of the gaps is. By just saying it is flawed, the reader has no idea whether that is true since the reader doesn't know what it is.

3rd paragraph: The first sentence would really irk someone who doesn't believe in evolution. You can't just state that someone is ignorant for not trusting in evolution; that isn't an argument you are just insulting readers. Take out your opinions on the topic (as it is clearly seen in the essay) and change word choices such as blatantly. Also, at the end of this paragraph you write, "...by stating untestable claims as facts..." to disprove intelligent design when evolution itself is untestable as well; there has been no experiment to prove how the earth formed by evolution that has worked.

4th paragraph: Intelligent design relies on the existence of God, which is also falsifiable. The existence of God is neither provable nor refutable. Just as no fossils have been found, there has been no evidence that God does not exist; therefore, it is still possible that He altered life. When talking about irreducibly complex systems, define what this is; you stated it in the beginning paragraph but if the reader doesn't know what it is, then they cannot hold any judgment as to whether it is an acceptable idea. Add more onto the

idea; give me examples as to how they were shown to not be irreducible after all. The reader will not just take your word; you need support to persuade the reader that you are correct.

5th paragraph: Just watch for small grammatical/tense errors in this paragraph. For instance, "...today enable scientists to trace..." (make it plural). Also, later on in the paragraph you use "later" and "over time" in the same sentence; you can remove the later and just say, "exaptation, co-option, and step-by-step adaptation over time gave rise..."

6th paragraph: Give more detail here: explain a certain situation in which this is true so the reader has an illustration of how half an eye is advantageous to the creature. Also, the fourth sentence should read, "...the evidence for a reducible..." you forgot the a.

Conclusion: I really like this ending, although it is a little pompous in believing that everyone should believe in evolution in order to "make our mark." The conclusion would be better though if you had a definite statement in the beginning that states that the theory of evolution is better than the theory of intelligent design. Clearly state your ideas so that the reader knows exactly what you are talking about.

Overall: I don't know where the [7] and other references are from; either put them in the footnotes or have a bibliography page at the end of the paper. Your paragraph lengths vary in sizes; I would like to see the ending paragraphs have a little bit more depth to your ideas but your ideas are well constructed and the different ideas in your paper flow nicely.