

## Paper 2 Review

### Summary:

- Irreducible Complexity (IC) is the most powerful argument in support of Intelligent Design (ID).
- IC is not a valid scientific argument.
- Behe's IC analogy - the mousetrap – is flawed as:
  - The trap can still fulfill its purpose with a piece missing, provided a small change in structure.
  - Even if a crucial piece is removed, the trap can perform other functions.
- IC may still exist in the natural world; however the human eye and bacterial flagellum are not good examples.
- Many IC arguments are of a God-of-the-gaps style.

### Structure and Appearance:

- Paragraphs are mostly easy to follow and lead the reader through the argument well, however:
  - The second paragraph, starting “An irreducibly complex system...” is rather long. The logic of the paragraph is good, but you may consider starting a new paragraph to discuss why Behe's argument is not substantiated. From the point “However, this assumption is not correct.” maybe?

### Grammar:

- A few instances of an awkward use of “... , however, ...” Some of these sentences could be re-written to flow more smoothly.

Thesis:

- You state your conclusion clearly at the beginning of the argument; however it would be best to re-state it at the end to bring the reader's focus back to your main points.
- You are making a very blatant assumption in your question: "if the flagellum were truly irreducibly complex, wouldn't it require only three essential proteins?" It is flawed to suppose that the paddle, motor, and rotor consist of only one protein each.
  - Why do a limited number of proteins need to be known for IC to be a valid conclusion?
- I cannot follow your logic when you state that an IC flagellum is a God-of-the-gaps argument. Is it not simply a bad argument? Are you referring to IC or ID overall as a God-of-the-gaps argument and have simply misplaced the sentence?
- Describe a bit of the watchmaker analogy- there is a small inconsistency in the jump between watches and eyes if the reader is not as familiar with the analogy.
- The last sentence at the end of paragraph 3 is not well stated. It is obvious after a careful reading that you intend the statement "The way everything is put together is so complex that it must have been designed." to be a summary of Paley's argument; but it is not phrased as such. To a skimming reader the sentence may appear to be your own opinion.
- Some information on Nilsson and Pelger's work would help the argument. Rather than simply stating that they proved an eye could have evolved, tell us briefly how. I am not suggesting a full-blown back story, a sentence or two would suffice.
- The *Yersinia pestis* disease transmission apparatus is well explained but you do not directly say what it has to do with the flagellum other than that they are similar. State

more plainly whether you believe one evolved through mutation of the other or a 'common ancestor'.

- In the final paragraph, you do not explicitly state what you are referring to as "not science." One has to re-read from a few lines up to see that it is Behe's lack of research that is being called into question.
- The last paragraph seems disjointed from the previous line of argument. I can see that you have concluded that line of argument there, but you need to tie it back to the next point before going on to explain Behe's apparent lack of research on scientific texts relating to the origin of the immune system.

General notes/ Language, Flow, and Audience reception:

- By the end of the fifth paragraph, the reader may feel that you are adopting a slightly insulting tone towards Behe's argument. I find it difficult to imagine disagreeing with you on this point, but it does not do to provoke the reader. An attempt to soften the tone of your argument may be beneficial here. Lead the reader to the conclusion that Behe's argument is incorrect rather than blatantly pointing it out.

Overall:

A few connecting and explanatory sentences would greatly improve the flow of the reasoning. However, this is a very strong argument; though it would benefit from a proper statement of the conclusion at the end.