



The Code

Joe Renick
Intelligent Design Network
New Mexico Division
nmidnet@comcast.net

July 2010

Darwin's theory of evolution – today called neo-Darwinism – is based on three central ideas:

- (1) All life on earth descended with modification from one or a few universal common ancestors who lived in the remote past.
- (2) Natural selection acting on random genetic variation is the dominant mechanism for change that accounts for life's diversity and history, and
- (3) These are purely natural unguided purposeless processes involving only physics and chemistry, chance and time.

These basic ideas are almost universally accepted as undisputed fact throughout the scientific world...at least this is what we are told. Accordingly, this is the way the story is told in public school biology classrooms across America.

However, while there is a great volume of evidence that can legitimately be interpreted in such a way as to support neo-Darwinism (this is the side of the story that is told in the biology classroom) there is another side to the story where the evidence just refuses to line up with the theory. This troubling evidence is not just a matter of some inconsequential side issue that is irrelevant to neo-Darwinism's scientific standing but rather it is foundational. Neo-Darwinism stands or falls on this evidence.

Students never hear this side of the story because it is censored from the classroom by "The Code", an unstated, unwritten code that says "*You do not question Darwin*".

"The Code" does not come from public education itself but has its origins in the scientific world which includes the universities, professional scientific organizations, science teacher associations and the National Academy of Science...to name a few. The official ideology held by the leadership of these organizations...collectively referred to as "the scientific establishment"...is that Darwin got it right, materialism is true and Creators exist only in the hearts and minds of the ignorant and superstitious.

An interesting commentary on "The Code" in the American scientific establishment comes from a Chinese paleontologist who a few years ago had been traveling around the world giving lectures on extraordinary fossil discoveries in China. American scientists were angered by his observations that the fossils showed sudden appearance of species rather than slow gradual evolutionary development as predicted by Darwin. He wryly commented...

"In China we can criticize Darwin but not the government. In America you can criticize the government but not Darwin."

Clearly, there is more going on here than objective scientific inquiry.

The problems with the fossil record that were well-known to Darwin in 1859 when he published his book "*On the Origin of Species*" are still with us today. While Darwin fully expected that his theory would eventually be upheld by future fossil discoveries, today, after 150 years of fossil research, it is generally accepted that Darwin was simply wrong about the fossils.

Stephen J. Gould, the late Harvard paleontologist referred to this problem of the fossil record as "the trade secret of paleontology". Gould said...

The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils.

Gould wrote this in 1977. A more recent publication further exposes the nature of the problem with the fossils.

In 1997 Cambridge University Press published a book by Robert L. Carroll at McGill University called *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*. This publication has become somewhat of a minor classic in its field and is probably the most important book published on this subject in the last 50 years.

In the preface and first chapter of his book, Carroll makes some extraordinary statements about the history of life predicted by Darwin compared to that constructed from an examination of the fossil record. He even criticizes textbooks for perpetuating this misleading picture of evolutionary history. Here is what Carroll has to say.

Few fossils are yet known of plausible intermediates between the invertebrate phyla, and there is no evidence for the gradual evolution of the major features by which the individual phyla or classes are characterized.

Progressive increase in knowledge of the fossil record over the past hundred years emphasizes how wrong Darwin was in extrapolating the pattern of long-term evolution from that observed within populations and species.

The fossil record is crucial to establishing the validity of any theory of biological origins that claims to give a scientific account of the history of life because it is the fossils that provide the only direct physical evidence regarding that history. If you cannot legitimately reconstruct that history in such a way that it naturally and convincingly "fits" the predictions of universal common ancestry descent, i.e., something that looks like Darwin's "tree of life", then you have no basis for claiming that universal common ancestry descent is a reliable theory of life's history...much less undisputed fact. All other arguments are subservient to this simple fact.

In spite of all of the research, all of the expensive shiny multi-colored heavily illustrated textbooks, all of the articles published in technical journals, all of the professional meetings, the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent on research and all of the public hype, when you simply go back to the evidence and listen to what it says, you find that neo-Darwinism reduces to little more than endless speculative just-so stories about the cause of something that never happened.

And **this**...according to Darwinists...is called **science** and **this** is what public education insists our children must be taught.

You can be sure that as long as “The Code” rules the science classroom, students will never hear a word about these deep and pervasive problems with Darwin’s theory. Students will continue to be **told** “what to think” rather than **taught** “how to think” because actual critical thinking would quickly expose the nonsense of neo-Darwinism and its underlying materialistic worldview.