

The Genetic Record

Even more so than the fossil record, the genetic record of past and present genomes exhibits a definite non-Darwinian pattern. In the first place, there are countless examples of [orphan genes](#) (also called [de novo genes](#)), i.e. genes that have no prior ancestors in the historical genetic record, and that appear to have arisen spontaneously. We know from the [Law of Conservation of Information](#), that this could not have happened from any undirected natural process.

Secondly, the attempts by evolutionary biologists to use the genetic record to construct a consistent hierarchical tree of life (TOL) have met with repeated failures, to the point where Darwin's TOL hypothesis is generally considered to be [false](#). Since the hierarchical TOL hypothesis has long been considered a [central prediction of Darwinian evolutionary biology](#), the demise of the TOL hypothesis also implies the falsification of Darwinism itself.

Thirdly, Darwin's theory predicts that the genomic information in later life forms must be more complex than earlier life, since the later life purportedly "evolved" by adding genetic information and becoming more complex. But recent genetic historical research has revealed the exact opposite. In fact, "[recent major surveys show that reductions in genomic complexity — including the loss of key genes — have successfully shaped the evolution of life throughout history](#)". The genetic record shows that early life was created with complex sets of de novo genes. Later forms of life then developed by breaking and blunting many of these original genes, in essence by "devolving" in complexity from the earlier forms. This could only have happened if an Intelligent Agent designed and created the original information in the earlier life forms. The required level of intelligence is astonishing, since the design of the earlier life forms included an innate ability for variations to occur and to form new life forms via this devolution process. (The concept of later life devolving from early life is argued forcefully by Michael Behe in his book "[Darwin Devolves](#)".)

Fourthly, attempts by evolutionary biologist to support Darwinism by promoting the myths of "[junk DNA](#)" and "[pseudogenes](#)" has been thoroughly discredited by recent research, including the [ENCODE](#) project.

Finally, biologist Winston Ewert has recently demonstrated research results in which a dependency graph approach provides a thoroughly consistent explanation for the historical genetic record. In fact, the fit of the historical genetic data to Ewert's dependency graph is orders of magnitude better than any attempt to fit the data with a Darwinian TOL. Ewert calls his approach the [Dependency Graph of Life](#).

As Ewert explains in his paper, the dependency graph is what computer software developers use to explain the relationships between modules of computer code. The similarities in this regard between the genetic record and software development further reinforces the assertions of Intelligent Design proponents, who argue that only an intelligent agency could have designed and produced the genetic information contained in biological life. After all, even Darwinists understand that a high level of intelligence is required to [develop and maintain computer code](#).