

Paper 2 Review: Theories in a Race:

Summary:

- Possible claims: Members of the intelligent design belief contradict each other. Science and religion cannot coexist in an interrelated way to answer the questions of the universe. Are these points of view misdirecting their energy into eliminating other belief systems, rather than answering questions?
- There is tension between science and religion, as demonstrated by the conflict between Dawkins and Collins.
- Many scientists have produced studies that disprove Behe, which Behe has ignored, thus weakening his argument.
- Behe claims the intelligent designer isn't God, but other main proponents of the cause do believe the designer is God, which contradicts Behe and his book.
- Intelligent design is merely a religious principle trying to disguise itself using science.

General/Specific:

- Introduction
 - Overall, your introduction is overwhelming. It is very large, and you present the reader with a ton of information. There seems to be multiple claims, and I am uncertain at this point as to where the essay is going.
 - Your fifth sentence is a fragment sentence.
 - The sixth sentence seems irrelevant to your earlier arguments – although this could be attributed to the fact that you don't seem to have one definite claim.
 - You can get rid of the seventh sentence, as well as the following sentences that list to the reader who you will be citing and what arguments you will be using. This is unnecessary and is just taking up space – you can get rid of them.
- Paragraph 1
 - Right off the bat, I am unsure how this argument is going to relate back to Behe's work.
 - Third sentence has some grammatical errors – should be “What Dawkins also opposes [is]....”
 - I feel like your quote transitions could be a little smoother – they feel like they were suddenly thrown in.
 - Second sentence on second page: should be “...belief systems that [are]...”
 - Some of your sentences are written in the passive voice – they would be more effective if they were written in the active voice.
 - Second to last sentence is very confusing, particularly the answers questions part.

- Paragraph 2
 - I feel like your sentences have a lot of excess words. That probably sounds weird, but they seem to talk in circles a little bit before getting to the point, which makes the paper difficult to read.
 - Again, there is a lot of information being presented, and it's unclear as to where it is going. I think you're trying to make multiple points, when you should try and stick to one point. Keep it concise.
 - It seems like you have two main ideas: that science and religion conflict, and that intelligent design is just creationism in design. I would throw out the first part – you don't need it to prove the second, and it's only cluttering your paper.
- Paragraph 3
 - First sentence is grammatically incorrect. Maybe change to "ID as a religious...."?
 - You bring up the whole science/religion dispute here again – I think you should let it go and focus more on Behe and the argument for or against him.
 - In the sentence introducing Collins, the word 'thought' isn't necessary after Darwinism.
- Paragraph 4
 - You start multiple consecutive sentences with the word 'however', which is unpleasant to read. Maybe a different transition word would prove useful.
 - At the end of the paragraph, you seem to be speaking down to religion. I would suggest trying to leave your personal feelings towards religion out of the paper.
- Paragraph 5
 - First sentence: get rid of "In" at beginning of sentence. Should simply be "An essay..."
 - I'm confused as to how the Old Testament is relevant here.
 - Last sentence should be "but rather" after the comma instead of just "rather"
 - I really strongly suggest getting rid of all the science/religion conflict arguments from your essay – you don't need it, and it only weakens your paper.
- Paragraph 6
 - Seems irrelevant, but again I feel like you have two separate claims and they are both weakening each other. You should pick one and focus on that instead of trying to prove both at the same time.
- Conclusion
 - Some of the sentences are very long and read like a run-on – maybe try breaking these up.
 - Third to last sentence begins to make assertions, which were not previously addressed in the paper.

Overall:

- You have some really strong arguments. I just think you need to hone in on what it is that you actually want to talk about. I got lost with the broad scope of information you showcased, and I think your paper would be overall more effective if you simply picked one claim to argue and stuck with it throughout the paper, rather than trying to argue multiple different things. However, this was a nice start. Good work!