

Review of *Theory Versus Faith*

Overall Comments:

- This paper has good ideas, but it needs some work, especially from a structural aspect. Your thoughts need to be better organized and easier to follow. Several times throughout this essay you repeat a similar point. What might help you get more organized is if you narrow down your thesis a bit. Maybe try to disprove one facet of ID instead of the entire time.

Introduction

- "Every radical scientific discovery... Darwin's explanation for the variation of life on Earth."
 - Eliminate these sentences. First, you can't make the blanket statement that you made in the first of these two sentences. It isn't true, and even if it were it would be very very hard to prove. The second sentence is meant to back up the first, but it doesn't do that.
- You say that Intelligent Design falls between Creationism and Darwinism, but then you say that the Dover Area School District defined ID as a religious idea. Maybe you should say that ID was created as an attempt to fall between Creationism and Darwinism?
- Thesis: Behe does not prove that Intelligent Design is a concrete and viable scientific theory.
 - This is a clear thesis, but maybe you might want to make it more specific. Disproving one facet of ID, not the entire thing, could make for a better paper.
 - One other problem I have with this thesis is that you say that Behe does not prove ID through appeal in court. Since the ID side of the Kitzmiller trial lost, clearly this is true, and possibly not worthy of a thesis.

Second Paragraph

- I'm not sure if I agree with your first sentence. Where does Behe claim that ID is right because you can't prove that it is wrong?
 - In any case, this sentence is not really related to the rest of the body. Pick a more appropriate opening sentence to introduce the ideas of this paragraph.

- You can't say that "Behe's favorite example is the human eye" unless you can support it.
- The explanation of the eye's complexity opens a major hole in Behe's using the eye as an example of irreducible complexity, but it doesn't necessarily open a hole in irreducible complexity by itself.

Third Paragraph

- This paragraph is a little bit confused. Your "thesis" for this paragraph is that Collins doesn't agree with ID. However, in stating his views, you repeat some of the things you said in the previous paragraph. I suggest that you incorporate Collins views about ID into other paragraphs, as opposed to making one distinct paragraph for all of his views on ID.

Fourth Paragraph

- This paragraph doesn't really introduce much new information.
 - You say that "the case efficiently combined many scientific opinions on the Matter of Intelligent Design and the overwhelming conclusion that it is not a viable scientific theory." However, you don't really talk about these opinions, just say that they exist.
 - Like what I said about your previous paragraph, I'm not sure if you should devote a whole paragraph to the Kitzmiller Trial. Instead take evidence from that trial about the failings of ID and relate them back to
- What evidence do you have to support your claim that teaching ID in class will lead to scientific stagnation, besides for that one quote? It is an interesting idea, and I want to hear more about it.

Conclusion

- Your conclusion needs to be strengthened. You do not fully sum up what you wrote about in the preceding four paragraphs.
- Don't use modifiers like "extremely." What does it mean that an explanation is "extremely Christian?"

12/7/11 7:15 PM

12/7/11 7:15 PM