Paper 2

You could delve more deeply into the classroom debate by drawing your own stand more clearly. It helps as a reader to understand where the author stands in order to perceive what he/she is trying to say. Furthermore, to be able to decide on if it should be taught or not you claim there has to be a strong background of knowledge in this particular topic, but with a topic like this, the people who satisfy the parameters is thin. That implies as small select few will make decisions based on the greater educational good for the majority of children. Is this okay? Do you think people personally involved should be included in greater numbers? Dig a little further into that scenario. Overall however, a good paper that needs a little more development into quotes and certain areas.

- "purest and simplest" almost implies a spiritual side. This automatically forces Behe and those that agree with him into a corner because it suggests a religious influence as an intelligent designer, pointing the finger at God.
- The quote used discussing what an ideology is defined as needs to be related more directly to the classroom. Are you saying that for something that is taught in the classroom, should at least be an ideology? Does it necessarily have to be? Is intelligent design an ideology?
- Is the first quote of the first body paragraph absolutely necessary? It appears to me that you are throwing this quote at the reader, and then shifting directly to the next quote. Also, more discussion and evaluation of these two quotes is necessary to validate the

inclusion in your paper. Simply putting in quotes from other people doesn't really encourage the reader to believe in your argument.

- The second body paragraph opens claiming Behe has disproved something needs reasoning to why and how he managed this.

- "The systems of blood clotting and vision are designed irreducibly complex". Is this your personal opinion on these or an opinion taken from another person? It is a simple statement made that appears as if the reader is supposed to believe that it is true.

- Make sure you clarify which side of the argument you are taking. If the reader becomes muddled then it becomes harder to persuade him.

- You say 90% of Americans say they believe in God. Does that have to imply 90% of Americans believe God would have to be the intelligent designer? Collins believes fully in evolution yet also in God, clearly those two things don't have to go together.

- Parents make defensive decisions when it involves their children, which clouds their judgment. This idea needs to be developed more. It is good, but it just does not get the attention needed to be as convincing as it could.

- Is intelligent design a scientific theory? How should it be taught? As a parallel to Darwinism, separately or as an opposing theory? Unanswered questions that relate directly to your conclusion. Could also be used to sell the conclusion you are trying to make the reader reach.