

## Paper 1 Review

### Intelligent design- Creationism in Disguise

Thesis: I identified your thesis as the following: "Is intelligent design a scientific alternative to Darwinism, or is it just creationism in disguise? Behe, unlike other supporters of intelligent design, claims that Intelligent Design is a mechanism of evolution. However, his argument is severely undermined by its strong "God of the Gap" implication. Even when assuming that intelligent design is compatible with the theory of evolution, the circumstances under which this mechanism take place are in conflict with science." I liked the use of a question in your thesis but be sure that that question is completely and explicitly answered throughout your essay. Many aspects of your thesis were addressed in your paper with good points but be sure to not stray away from the argument you made initially. Any information that is not necessary to your argument can be left out, remember what the wise Professor Kaplan always says, "The concise argument is the strong argument." (Or something along those lines.)

Overview: I thought your paper made some good points and attempted to make many more, but the wording of some of your sentences were awkward and made what you were trying to say difficult to understand. Try going back and reading your paper to yourself allowed and you will find several instances where words like "the" and "a" are left out. Also word choice is something you may want to take a look at. Overstating your arguments actually weakens your point and makes it sound like a more emotional argument rather than a logical one, which I assume your going for. Please keep in mind

I'm not trying to bust your balls, I'm just trying to provide some constructive criticism that will improve your paper; so if my tone sounds harsh it is nothing personal (I don't even know who you are).

Intro: I enjoyed your thesis and thought you took on a good argument.

- Be sure to provide support for the things in your thesis and only things in your thesis. At times you made arguments and presented ideas that had little to do with the overall point of your paper.
- In the last sentence add "The" in front of counterarguments to make the sentence make sense.

Body 1:

- In the first sentence I would add (ID) after the first time you say Intelligent Design just to make it clear what ID means later on in the paper.
- In the 4<sup>th</sup> sentence "It directs people to consider" consider revising this, it is phrased awkwardly and would flow better with some work.
- The last sentence in the second paragraph makes it seem like it is unclear to everyone whether ID is a scientific theory or not. This makes the intro sentence of the third paragraph seem unwarranted by saying that Behe is "one of the handful" that believes it is a scientific theory. I would consider making a different point in your transition sentence so that it fits the next paragraph better.
- Also in the second sentence remove the commas between article and called and make end the sentence with "Evolution" and then start a new sentence.

#### Body 2:

- Change the first sentence to “One of the primary reasons Behe endorses ID is the limited exploratory power of evolution.” A little wordy before.
- The 6<sup>th</sup> sentence does not make much sense... what does “from inorganic to single structures.” Mean? Rework the whole sentence.
- Also is the following statement really true? “Until this day, the best theory cannot give a satisfactory explanation on the subject” is that something only Behe claims or is that a fact accepted by everyone. If everyone accepts it provide evidence. Elaborate on this claim.

#### Body 3:

- I think you might be confused about the definition of organic and inorganic based on the way you used the words in the first sentence. Organic simply means containing carbon. Both living and nonliving things contain carbon. I think the proper words to use in this is “nonliving to living.”
- Also in the first sentence add “have” in between must and act.
- In the last sentence remove “following what Behe instructed” and add a comma between designer and despite.

#### Body 4:

- In the second sentence what kind of scientific methods does Shermer highlight? Are they methods that disprove or discredit what Behe is saying? Elaborate on this sentence.
- Some of the sentences in this paragraph are worded funny so read through it carefully and consider changes that would help the flow of the paper.

- Specifically the last sentence. You make a good point but you have to read through it a couple of times for it to make sense. Try to make your point a little more clear.

Body 5:

- This paragraph is well written.
- I would suggest adding according to Behe somewhere in the last sentence just to make it more clear that he is the one who believes that anything intricately complex must have been designed.

Body 6:

- I like the opening sentence of this paragraph, should it maybe be in quotations?
- The 5<sup>th</sup> sentence is where you lost me though. The sentence “When a concept cannot be attributed to a certain set of subjects, it is naturally irrefutable, therefore cannot be categorized as a scientific theory.” Is too ambiguous, I don’t know what your point is or where your logic is coming from.
- Also consider rewording the following sentence as well, it is a tad bit confusing.
- I would take another look at the entire paragraph it is hard to understand.

Body 7:

- In the second sentence add “in” between intervene and the, change during to at, take away period and change time to times.
- In the 5<sup>th</sup> sentence change “both indicate” to “this indicates”.
- What “scene” are you talking about in the 5<sup>th</sup> sentence. It is unclear what your trying to say.

- In the last sentence add “the” in between of and designer.
- Also be sure to address how Behe’s neglect to explain whether or not this intelligent designer is natural or supernatural weakens his argument.

Body 8:

- Reword the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence “If this designer is an outer space intelligent,” doesn’t make sense.
- You say “This loop contradicts with the initial purpose of Intelligent Design.” But elaborate on this!!! What exactly does it contradict, be explicit.

Body 9:

- In the second sentence change “to or not to” to “whether or not to”, it will make it sentence flow better.
- Also towards the end of the paragraph you use the word omnipresence when referring to the intelligent designer, which means being everywhere at all times. Sure that is what religion says God is, but is Behe really claiming that the intelligent designer is God. Also you asserted earlier that Behe claimed the intelligent designer intervened only at certain “necessary” moments in time. This would contradict it’s omnipresence. I would use a different, more fitting word here.
- In the last sentence add “the” between in and Intelligent and change as to is.

Concluding: I felt like that last two paragraphs had little to do with your thesis and your paper would have been much stronger without them. I would suggest ending the paper after the 9<sup>th</sup> body paragraph and writing the conclusion there. Be sure your conclusion once again states what the point of your paper was and leaves the reader thinking about

the topic you addresses and agreeing with you. Over all well done! You just need to work on the flow and word choice and clear up a few parts and you'll have a great paper. Also remember the writing center is your friend ☺.