

Review of “Is intelligent design even a worthwhile consideration in the debate on the origin of species?”

Thesis: “To simply state it, if this book is the best intelligent design advocates have to offer, then there is no hope for a successful movement to overthrow Darwinian evolution.” This is a good thesis but are you trying to disprove intelligent design as a reasonable cause to the origins of the earth or are you stating that evolution is a better theory? This thesis seems like you are trying to compare it to evolution which in most of your body paragraphs you merely refute certain arguments that intelligent design argues. Make your argument more clear by just stating intelligent design is not a good theory and then in the conclusion you can bring up evolution and how it fits better into explanations for life.

Intro: I was a little confused when I read “to the convenience, or anguish of...” because it wouldn’t be convenient for intelligent design to have a theory that doesn’t help argue it; it would be convenient for evolution, however. Also, your paragraph is a little long so try combining sentences to shorten it; the sentence “if directly asked...” doesn’t need to be in the paragraph so you could combine it with the next sentence to get something like, “The lack of followers could be attributed to the theological component but more likely due to the problems posed in his arguments.” Also, pretend the reader has no previous knowledge of irreducibly complex so maybe define it so that you really can walk any reader through your paper, not just people in the seminar.

1st paragraph: Some of your arguments seem to be against evolution instead of intelligent design, especially in the mousetrap example. When you add a component it still adds to the complexity but in the case of evolution this wouldn’t be a good argument because

evolution is supposed to simplify. So if you were arguing that evolution wouldn't work here because the mechanism has too many parts, it would work but not against an argument of intelligent design. Also, evolution does not always "simplify the system to the most efficient state." The panda's thumbs are not efficient for it to eat in a timely manner and the human blood clot sequence is too complex with multiple passageways. If evolution was to have brought about all these things then it should be consistent with your idea of simplification. Also, the sentence, "Evolution could easily have created a working..." doesn't make sense because you seem to state that evolution can take chaos, turn it into order, but then back to chaos so it is irreducibly complex. Try re-wording that argument so it makes sense to the reader. You also have a fragment in the beginning of the paragraph and function able should be functional (one word). Also watch the tenses, in the first sentence on the 3rd page ("there have to be other designs" instead of "there has to be other designs"). Finally, the sentence, "to present a convincing argument..." is not a credible argument against intelligent design due to the evident holes in evolution as well. If you say that intelligent design is not a convincing argument due to holes in the foundation, then what about the hole in how life came about in evolution as well? Both are unknown.

2nd paragraph: The first sentence has too many parts. The reader had to re-read it a couple of times to be able to understand what you were trying to say. Overall, this paragraph has good, convincing arguments against intelligent design.

3rd paragraph: Your first sentence is a good start but your first quote is wrong; it should be," Almost a century and a half after Darwin proposed his theory..." Watch your sentences later on; you have some commas that should be periods (...or blood clotting

mechanisms. Where did the eye suddenly appear, and if...hand in action?" Also, we don't know the power of a supernatural being. They could possess all the power in the world to alter life without leaving a physical trace. God of the gaps is not saying evolution cannot explain how these systems came into existence, since people who support intelligent design do not believe in evolution. It is more like "there is no other evidence as to how these systems came into existence so therefore an intelligent designer must have..." Throughout this paragraph, try breaking up your sentences into smaller sentences; the last sentence is 5 lines long. Put a ; after "...the origin of the human race; that is, assuming..."

The spacing on this page looks a little off as well (the amount of spaces at the top and bottom of the page).

4th paragraph: watch your comma usage. In the second sentence it should be "...in the human ear and they transfer..." Also, put a period after "oval window" instead of a comma. Also, a comma goes after the "And" in the last sentence.

5th paragraph: The theory of intelligent design should not be labeled as "inaccurate." It is not scientifically provable, which would be a better description, but there has been no evidence to disprove the existence of a God altering or creating life. The Wakefield experiment was a controlled scientific experiment with current data that was not conducted properly and verified for the wrong reasons. Intelligent design is not trying to persuade anyone to believe in God or anything else, it is merely trying to answer the question to the origin of the Earth. Wakefield never meant to cause serious harm, but his financial incentives led him to publish the arguments. Again, in the last sentence watch your verb tenses ("is" should be "are") and "than" should be "then".

Overall: Go over your paragraph length and try breaking them up. Sometimes when they are too long, you lose the reader in all the words. Your 4th and 2nd paragraphs have great arguments towards your thesis, but you should state that each argument weakens the intelligent design theory: make sure you keep leading the reader back to your original theme of intelligent design not being a reasonable theory. Your conclusion is a mix of argument and an ending trying to put all the pieces together, which needs some editing. You should again clearly state your position on the topic of intelligent design, but the last sentence about not being in books is a good ending since it further expands the topic. The paper is sound grammatically and structure wise, it just needs a little bit of tweaking to make your arguments stand out more and not have any holes to disprove them.