

Review of *Behe's Analogies: Helpful or Misleading?*

Overall Comments:

- This is a good paper. You lay out the argument in your opening paragraph well, and have good logical flow throughout the paper. On the whole, it is well written and there are few mistakes. What needs the most work is the concluding paragraph, and several ideas may need to be fleshed out/rethought a bit. Overall though, a very solid job.

Introduction

- Thesis: the analogies that Behe uses are flawed and too simply for the concepts they are trying to explain
 - This is a solid thesis. It is clear and specific.
- You don't need to say "analogies in the science realm." Instead say scientific analogies
- I really like your point that an argument that relies too heavily on analogies is likely to be a poor argument. Expand a little more on this, either in the intro or in subsequent paragraphs. I don't think you go back to that, you just talk about how bad his analogies themselves are.

Second Paragraph

- Second sentence: could not have evolved gradually *by* evolution
- When describing the mousetrap, don't say base, "hammer, spring, catch, etc." Behe's mousetrap only has five parts, it doesn't make sense to list four of them and then say "etc."
- Get rid of the word "glaring." Unnecessary modifier.
- I agree with the last point made in this paragraph (that comparing mousetraps to evolving biological organisms is comparing apples and oranges), but I agree with this because I believe in evolution. Behe, however, doesn't believe in evolution, and is using this analogy to try to show us evidence against it. Because of that your last point doesn't really make to me, in regards to Behe's argument.

Third Paragraph

- Typo in second sentence (that uses and unnecessary...)

- Again, the problem I had with the end of the your first paragraph comes up again.
 - “A Rube Goldberg is a human designed contraption with exact specifications to carry out an single task while biological systems evolve with no specific blueprints or intentions.”
 - You are basically saying that Behe is wrong in using this analogy because biological systems evolve and a Rube Goldberg contraption does not evolve. However, Behe is trying to show that biological systems do not in fact evolve. You aren’t proving that Behe is wrong, just saying that he is wrong.
- You say this analogy makes “Behe’s intelligent designer seems rather unintelligent.” The designers behind Rube Goldberg machines are in fact intelligent, they just make inefficient systems. Perhaps its not that Behe’s intelligent designer seems unintelligent, but rather Behe’s intelligent designer does not seem perfect, or God-like.

Fourth Paragraph

- Behe’s elephant analogy is so bad... wow I forgot about this one.
- I’m not sure if I agree with your statement that saying there is no explanation for irreducibly complex systems other than an intelligent designer is bad science. If true irreducibly complex systems in nature did indeed exist, then I think there might be some evidence for an intelligent designer – what else could it be? Of course, there is no such thing as an irreducibly complex system in nature.
 - Besides for that one little thing, very good paragraph.

Conclusion

- Saying that scientists are poor communicators is an unsupported statement. Back that up somehow, if you can find a legit source.
- The mousetrap, Rube Goldberg machine, and elephant are not all analogies meant to explain molecular biology. The mousetrap analogy is meant to explain basic irreducible complexity, and elephant analogy is just really, really dumb, and doesn’t say anything about anything.
 - Your conclusion oversimplifies your arguments.

- Delete your last sentence and think of a different one... it doesn't seem to fit, at least to my taste.
- This conclusion needs some work... you don't tie up the three analogies that you use as well as you should.