

Paper 1 Review

Summary:

- ID can be clearly seen to be concealed creationism.
- The designer in Intelligent Design (ID) is ultimately the Christian God.
 - However, Behe tries to avoid conflict by not directly saying this in his book.
- There has been tension between religion and science since the introduction of evolutionary thought.
 - Dawkins vs. Collins
 - The dispute between science and religion can be compared to that between Neo-Darwinism and ID. In this light, one can question if ID advocates are merely subversive evangelical Christians.
- Instead of lessening the clash between science and religion, ID seems to intensify it as:
 - ID believers say that “the intelligent designer is behind all that the universe has to offer,” and
 - Non-believers label ID advocates as Christians attempting to spread their religion by disguising it as science.
- The problem with the disagreement between science and religion is not peoples’ beliefs; it is that “scientists are in a race to eliminate the beliefs that contradict theirs.”
 - It should not be so. The race should rather be one to “unlock the mysteries of the universe through the acceptance of other beliefs as legitimate.”

Structure and Appearance:

- Most of your paragraphs are nearly a page long. Not only does this present the reader with a daunting block of text, but becomes quite annoying if the reader gets distracted in the middle of a paragraph or feels the need to re-read your reasoning to better understand a point.

Grammar:

- Only a few things that have been over looked:
 - In the first paragraph, the sentence “How is the larger dispute between science and religion fueled by ID proponents that are possibly concealed Evangelical Christians that are using science as a means to spread Christianity.” lacks a question-mark.
 - In the last sentence of the first paragraph, you do not explain what will “later [be] used to see whether or not these points of views are misdirecting their energy into eliminating other belief systems”
- The sentence “Some questions they both attempt to answer are related to the purpose of our existence and the reasons behind the way the universe is.” in the second paragraph is poorly worded and difficult to follow at a first time reading.

Thesis:

- Your argument’s conclusion is well argued towards in the body of the text, but I feel it would be beneficial do devote more of the introduction to your main ideas rather than listing your sources. If your main argument is shown in the introduction, the reader then knows what they are looking for in the rest of the paper.

- There is a small inconsistency in the flow of the argument from paragraphs four to five. You should state if you are drawing a correlation between Collins's argument and the idea that ID is not widely accepted in the scientific community, or if you have concluded the line of argument dealing with Collins and are now moving to a new point.
- I do not see the relevance to your argument of the quote by Dawkins. ("The God of the old testament...")
- Twice you mention the fact that Behe left information out of his book. (Ussery and Pennock) These arguments may carry more weight if they were referred to in the same line of reasoning rather than spilt over three pages.
- There is a rather prominent contradiction in paragraph eight of your argument. Here you state that ID is an attempt to find a co-existence between religion and science, though through all the previous paragraphs you have been saying that ID is only widening the gap between the two.

General notes and Audience reception:

- As stated above, I would suggest breaking up your paragraphs so that the reader is not put off by expanses of writing.
- Your writing allows the ideas to flow from one to another well. Aside from some small grammatical error, the argument is easy to follow.

Overall:

You lead the reader through your reasoning very well, and have made a strong argument.