

# Darwin Misunderstood

**Arie Nicolaas Van Den Berg**

Naktuinbouw plant research institute, Roelofarendsveen, The Netherlands

**Email address:**

[seeds@caiw.nl](mailto:seeds@caiw.nl)

**To cite this article:**

Arie Nicolaas Van Den Berg. Darwin Misunderstood. *American Journal of Life Sciences*. Vol. 3, No. 4, 2015, pp. 322-331.

doi: 10.11648/j.ajls.20150304.21

---

**Abstract:** Darwin did not specify: "Species". Darwin did not know the difference between "Phenotypic and Genotypic features". "Natural Selection" cannot produce new species. Spontaneous mutations do not exist. Mutants have no offspring. Darwin did not make tests to confirm his theory. Evolution, with natural selection, is neither about the Origin of Life, nor about New Life but is about the Optimal Preservation of all existing living creatures.

**Keywords:** Origin of Life, Origin of Species, Chance, Natural Selection, Spontaneous Mutations

---

## 1. Introduction

Shortly after Mendel published his findings in the 19<sup>th</sup> century about laws in genetics and phenomenon's in nature that you have to consider when breeding new vegetable varieties, the grandfather of the writer founded the family seed business in 1886, improving existing vegetable varieties, producing and trading the seeds. His father continued the growing business during 50 years and now he is himself also involved in the international seed business for more than 65 years. After his study in plant breeding and selection at Wageningen University in The Netherlands he studied languages and practical horticulture with plant breeders in England, in Germany and in France. After studying also Spanish and Italian he started branches of the family seed firm in England, Spain, Portugal and Italy.

The writer is the breeder/owner of many new tomato-cucumber-, melon- and pepper varieties and he also has the Breeders Rights of the very first in-vitro developed cucumber variety as well as patents on in vitro grafting of plantlets produced in cell cultures and by cloning seedlings.

The writer believes he is the first modern plant breeder with more than 65 years of practical world wide experience and the benefit of more than a century of progress in genetics since Darwin wrote his book: "On the origin of species", to comment on Darwin's philosophy.

Especially in the recent 50 years, knowledge about genetics has developed rapidly and at the same time secularization has become more widespread. More and more people are to day estranged from the Bible and the book of Genesis about the Creation and there are many who are

convinced that with the evolution theory of Darwin there is scientific proof that there is no God and Life is just the result of chance. Often they add - only because they are not quite sure - that "All scientists agree". The fact is that scientists usually do not agree about anything and certainly not in the case of the origin of life.

On the following pages it is explained that Darwin misunderstood the meaning of his observations and his followers also misunderstood or misinterpreted Darwin's philosophy. This was partly due to the fact that Darwin c.s. did not have any knowledge of DNA; genetics was still in its infancy and many of his followers were at the time, in the Victorian era, longing for arguments against the dogmas of the Church. Atheists could now assume that Darwin's Evolution Theory proves that there was no Creator and that all existing forms of life, all "species", were just the result of chance, followed by natural selection and spontaneous mutations.

Clearly, atheists only believe that the origin of life was just accidental and a question of chance, but they call it science. Darwin's philosophy however was based on the confused identity of the subjects he observed – not just "birds" but a sub strain of finches – not just "insects" but a sub strain of a type of beetles - and was also based on the wrongful explanation of the differences he observed, which were not genotypic and lasting for generations after generations but phenotypic and disappearing again with time after one or more generations. Darwin unfortunately also neglected his duty as a researcher to test the validity of his observations.

Creationists on the contrary admit that they believe that the origin of life was created and they accept as proof the breath taking complexity, splendor, perfection, abundance and durability of the flora and fauna that we are part of. The perfection and durability of our ecosystem is beyond comprehension when we see that the entire system- the co-existence of animals, plants, insects, micro elements and men have been functioning, virtually unchanged, for many thousands of years and with all the many billions of creatures, large and small that are part of the creation, with each and every creature still functioning perfectly in its proper place in our eco system and in the food chain since the creation – the climax of durability.

Men have not been able to add a single lasting letter too the immense book of nature. All the man made new breeds of animals and plants always disappear rapidly and within a few generations when the breeders stop looking after them.

It is remarkable in this light that scientists are indeed seriously looking for life in space. They are not aware that they are in fact looking in space for more work of the Creator. Because a similar event like life on earth, elsewhere in space, again not created but also as a result of chance, is out of question.

The human body, the most complex living creature, consists of ca.100.000 different proteins. Each protein consists of double chains, made up of 1 to 20 amino acids, the carriers of the genetic characteristics: the DNA.

The ca. 100.000 proteins differ from one another because in these double chains the 1 to 20 amino acids are fixed together in an order that is different for each protein and gives each protein its unique structure.

The mathematician Ivars Peterson – Kent State University - calculates in his book “The Jungles of Randomness” that there is a vast number of possible different DNA combinations: an astronomical number of 20 to the power of 400.

That all living creatures on earth consist of combinations of “only” ca. 100.000 proteins, from a possibility of a number with more than 400 noughts, cannot be explained with “chance”. This number is so large that it is virtually unimaginable but we can understand it a little when we see that of the 7 billion people on earth there are no two persons totally identical. Even twins are not 100 per cent identical.

## 2. Some Details of Darwin's Evolution Theory

### 2.1. “Species” 1

When Darwin mentions “Species”, in his booklet “The Origin of Species”, it is all-important that we know what he exactly meant with the word “Species”. Unfortunately Darwin did not explain the word “species” further and also his editor omitted to include the word “species” in his explanatory list of “difficult” words. This was a very serious oversight because it is about the heart of the matter and it is the cause of very serious misunderstandings that last till to day.

### 2.2. “Species” 2

Darwin's study of “Species” has been clearly misunderstood by himself and by his followers when they assumed that the study was about: “All living creatures”. Darwin writes that according to his theory of “Survival of the fittest”, different types of pigeons and finches have developed in different parts of the world, selected naturally by the differing living conditions at different locations, from an earlier type of pigeons and an earlier type of finches, a selection caused by adjusting to and survival in the new environment. But when researchers and breeders of plants and cattle use the word “species” then it must first be made very clear what they exactly mean with “species” because it has many different meanings. “Species” could relate to: animals, or birds, or finches, or Australian finches, or Star finches or a subspecies of the Star finches.

### 2.3. “Species” 3

From the publications about Darwin's research we can establish that his work always concerned *the relatively small differences* that he observed between *groups of the same kind* that lived longer apart from the main group of the same kind.

### 2.4. Genotypic and Phenotypic Characteristics

In the following pages it is made clear that the differences that Darwin observed in his “species” were not *genotypic* and lasting as he believed but *phenotypic* and disappearing under different growing circumstances and in following generations. The confusion is very clear: Darwin mixed up species, varieties, sorts, sub-sorts and strains, he just wrote about “species”. As is usual with confusing conclusions - and also the case with the Evolution Theory -, to the laymen the conclusion of the theory seems very plausible, it is partly right but the best part is a mistake and the final conclusion is wrong. The only correct observation is, when looking at the finches on the Galapagos Islands, that the genome of these finches enables the finches to adapt their bill to different foods and develop in time by natural selection a stronger or a finer bill. The mentioned differences in the types of bill of the finches in the Galapagos Islands are phenotypic differences, the result of the recombination of their own genes by natural selection after a number of generations. These differences will change with changing living conditions.

## 3. Survival of the Fittest

### 3.1. Natural Selection

According to Darwin's evolution theory is the result of Natural Selection: that members of a kind that are less adapted to survive in continuously changing environments and living conditions, reproduce themselves at a lower rate than the better equipped members of that kind. For instance, after many generations of a beetle on a windy island, the beetles of the surviving generation had no wings. Their

winged ancestors were blown into the sea and after many generations, step by step, the relatives with smaller wings survived better and in the end the beetles on that island had no wings at all.

### 3.2. *Survival of the Best Fit*

Darwin: "Survival of the fittest is a form of natural selection in a species and results in a new species."

The first part of this sentence is correct but the final conclusion is a mistake. Selection always takes place with already existing characteristics. With natural selection there is no rebuilding, nothing is added. Selection is only the regrouping of already available genetics in a creature and can never produce new species, only slightly different looking species of the same kind. The changes Darwin noticed were not genotypic, not permanent but the result of adaptation to a different environment, for better survival. The slight differences are phenotypic and can change again in time, after generations and with again changing living conditions. One of the conditions for survival is of course that the variety is not homogeneous at first. When all the beetles in the above example had been genetically identical, all beetles would have been blown into the sea and the wind would have caused the extinction of this beetle.

### 3.3. *Darwin Did Not Test His Philosophy*

It was a scientific shortcoming of Darwin that he has not considered to relocate his finches to their original habitat to see if his evolution theory was sound and valid. Nor could the writer find any record of such tests made by his followers. Darwin should have returned his finches to their original habitat for observation during a number of generations. Such tests would certainly have unveiled his error of judgment.

The writer did indeed make such a test with some extraordinary attractive Gerbera plants (*Gerbera cass.*) that he found on the Island of La Gomera of the Canary Islands. The large flowers were 100 % double, very unusual and so bright red that they flamed in the sun. The stems of the flowers were thick and strong; a very important characteristic for Gerbera growers because most Gerbera varieties have weak stems and then each flower must be supported with a thin piece of wire, a very costly procedure for the growers. After obtaining permission he took the plants to a specialized Gerbera grower in Naaldwijk in The Netherlands, who planted them in his glasshouse with a computer-controlled climate, ideal for Gerbera's.

The following year the disappointment was complete: The long thick stem and the large fire red 100% double flower that these plants produced in the Canary Islands, were no comparison with the thin stem and the terra cotta color of the now single flower that the same plants produced one year later in The Netherlands. The conditions of soil and climate in the special glasshouse were ideal for gerberas but the hours and the intensity of the daylight in the Netherlands were unsuitable for the plants in question. The Gerbera is very demanding for the type of light it receives and is

therefore only rarely found in the wild.

This remarkable difference in appearance of the gerbera plants in The Netherlands was clearly not a case of evolution but just a change of expression of the existing characteristics, a change of *the phenotype* of the Gerbera plants. When he later returned these plants to the Canary Islands, their original environment, they reassumed after some time their previous glorious appearance. Their genetically fixed characteristics, their *genotype* remained unchanged.

Darwin has only been able to study a very small number of the many millions of species of plants, animals and insects on our planet. That is why Darwin could formulate his mistaken theory that the adaptation of a species to changing conditions, for survival of the fittest - explains the origin of all species of plants, insects and animals and even of men.

Darwin was reluctant to publish his theory, he had a religious background and he realized that this theory could be used to deny the work of the Creator. It is not unlikely that his reluctance could also have been due to his intuition that perhaps he had not gathered sufficient material to confirm his theories. He indeed once said that he considered that the fossil proof that he found for his theory probably was insufficient.

## 4. Behavior by Instinct 1

Darwin jumped to the conclusion that the behavior of the relatively few living creatures that he observed, would determinate the origin, the coming into existence of all species. But behavior is typical for each creature; it belongs to the creature and is part of the creature. Behavior is inseparable and can never be the origin of the creature.

"Jumping to conclusions" can be observed in many lectures and debates. It is a trick – sometimes unintentional - in debates and used very frequently, for instance by politicians, to defend a wrong argument. However there is no reason to believe that Darwin realized that his conclusions were wrong. But speakers who "jump to conclusions" in a debate abuse the fact that hardly anybody can evaluate the full meaning of two different subjects at the same moment. When the first argument seems plausible one will automatically concentrate his attention on the second subject, taking the first (false) conclusion for granted.

Only a few of Darwin's colleagues did understand what Darwin was investigating but many in his general public loved the outcome because they thought that it meant that they could now pay less attention to all the Victorian rules of the Church; but that was not the idea of Darwin. Even to day there are still people who believe that the ancestors of men were apes. Notwithstanding the fact that they can see that adopted children from parents that still live in the stone age, go to university in Amsterdam. They can also see that our other ancestors, the builders of the pyramids were at least as clever as we are now. No trace of evolution.

People, who pretended that men are not equal and that there has been something like an evolution from a lower quality of men to higher quality of men, were justifying

slavery and discrimination. The mistaken idea that “survival of the fittest” produces a higher quality species from a lower quality species, was part of the devilish concept by the German Nazis of “Supermen”, “Übermenschen” - and we all know the terrible outcome.

## 5. Behavior by Instinct 2

Behavior by instinct cannot be explained with evolution: a small child is eager to stand up; it has no experience that standing is better than creeping or laying down: because while laying down it received full attention and treatment and especially the first experiments trying to stand up require a lot of energy. The female King Penguin (*A. Patagonica*) walks an incredible long distance to open sea to get food and she finds weeks later without fail her young and its father again in a dense and massive number of in our view totally identical male penguins. The minuscule embryo like young of a kangaroo, finds the nipple in the pouch of its mother.

Evolution of instinct is impossible because in many cases the instinct is absolutely critical for the survival of the creature. Without certain perfect instincts or with underdeveloped instincts, there is no survival of that creature. A young mouse probably has never seen a cat but knows immediately what to do when a cat turns up later in life.

## 6. Homo Sapiens

Darwin believed, just as contemporaries that man originated 6000 years earlier. Around 1650 Bishop Ussher had calculated that the creation took place 4004 years before Christ but since Darwin the dates have been adjusted constantly. Not long ago it was believed that *Homo erectus* existed some 750.000 years ago and that modern man, *Homo sapiens* evolved only 100,000 years ago. Based on bone fragments complete skeletons were drawn and drawings were made to show how our ancestors and their environment looked like.

Apart from the fact that it is risky to reconstruct a complete individual of a large group, based on a fragment of just one skull that was found of the whole group, it is also not scientifically justified to assume that the whole group was identical to the specimen found. Just the fact that only some bones have been found of only one or a few specimens, could indicate that it concerned one or more mutants or outcasts because of a rare disorder, such as Paget's disease that causes abnormal growth of bones, namely of the skull.

But since the remains have been found of human beings, *Homo sapiens sapiens* who did not live 100.000 years but 1 million years before us and nothing indicates that, apart from their tools, they were different from us. Also indications have been found that human beings were sailing the seas near Java one million years ago.

Recently it has been established that also the ancestors of *Homo erectus* did walk straight up, contrary to what was believed so far.

The conclusion must be that man did not evolve at all

during one million years and then it is obvious that that has not been the case in the many years before. Too often the fact is ignored that the dating techniques to establish the age of material found – which are becoming better and better – are in the first place an indication about the minimum age of the material. Of course all unknown conditions and circumstances during many thousands or millions of years, that could have had their influence on the material found, could not be taken into account. Recently it was established that a certain landscape, always believed to be the result of thousands of years of flooding and erosion, was in fact the result of a sudden wave of giant wall of melting water, ice and debris, coming from a long distance away. Rising temperatures had caused the collapse of a huge dam of ice between mountains that held back an enormous lake, hundreds of meters deep.

## 7. Evolution

Paleontologists have increasing proof for the theory that about 65 million years ago nearly all life on earth was destroyed when a giant meteor struck the earth. This can only mean that the evolution, as understood by Darwinists, the evolutionary development of the lowest forms of life with our present flora and fauna as result, could only have started after the then total annihilation of prehistoric forms of life. Based on the fact that for tiny little steps of evolutionary development by natural selection in a sub-species, very large numbers of one breed are needed in each generation and that for the completion of each little step of evolution, a huge number of generations and a great space of time is needed, *a period of only 65 million years is far too short to explain all present forms of life on earth with evolution*. It must be taken into account that our flora and fauna to day is extremely complex, varied beyond imagination, for a large part even not yet discovered or described and apart from some now extinct species, has remained unchanged for many thousands of years.

For instance the Palm Tree belongs to one of the 2700 so far known varieties of *Areca's* and in that group there are species that only bear fruit after 100 years. That is a very slow life cycle – for evolution – compared with the life cycle of one year for a French bean or of a few days of certain insects.

The KENTIA PALM *Howea Forsteriana* exists almost exclusively on the minuscule little island of Lord Howe, in the Great Pacific, 450 miles East of Australia and 300 miles North of New Zealand. The small Lord Howe Island, of ca. 6 miles long and 1 mile wide accommodates not only the unique *Howea Forsteriana* but also some 200 more unique plant varieties and 70 different animals that nowhere else can be found in the entire world. (Encarta).

That tiny island lacks the conditions that are necessary for the evolution of so many unique forms of life.

The island is *volcanic*, which means “new” in geological terms and the island is not only too small for the vast numbers that there should have been in each generation of

each species, for the evolution via natural selection and survival of the best fit of the species. Moreover there has not been the required very long time for each single little step of the great number of steps of evolution of each sort, to comply with the theory of Darwin.

Of the *Kentia Howea* palm there are only just a few thousand trees on Lord Howe Island. Their presence, almost exclusively on this small island and nowhere else in nature in the whole world, cannot be explained with evolution. On Lord Howe Island the work of the Creator is very evident.

## 8. Natural Selection and Spontaneous Mutation of Species

Darwin's philosophy that these two phenomenon in nature play a part in evolution, in the sense of the development of new life, amazingly has hardly been criticized but in stead accepted and repeated by his followers. It is remarkable that Darwin's mistaken conclusions about his observations with finches, beetles and more, on such an important issue as the origin of man and the existence of our Creator, has met with so little criticism during so many years.

## 9. Mutants

Without any exception mutants are individuals with a damaged genome. The genome of such a creature is not true to the type to which it belongs and that shows often in an "off-type" appearance of that individual.

All creatures on our planet have been very strictly programmed for the survival of the species to which they belong. The slightest fault in the genome, results in invalidity, disease and infertility. No mutant can reproduce naturally and in the case that there is a descendent it will certainly be sterile, like a mule.

Breeders will sometimes damage the genes of a species on purpose with a chemical, by radiation or otherwise to get a mutant that they like better but none of their products, the mutants, can reproduce themselves in a natural way and therefore cannot have any lasting effect at all on the existing variety of life on earth. Without the special treatment of breeders there are no new generations of mutants.

## 10. Spontaneous Mutants Do Not Exist

Every mutant is the result of one or more of many possible causes and is sterile. Most off-type plants found in a field with for instance a crop of peas or broad beans, are no mutants at all; they are from seeds that were left behind in the sowing machine, after sowing earlier a different variety of peas. Small visible differences sometimes occur when a plant did get accidentally an overdose of fertilizer, for instance from a bird or damaged when still very small, by a tractor wheel and survived, crippled or damaged by "drifting" chemicals when a nearby field was sprayed with chemicals. Sometimes plants "grow wild" after being nearly but not

quite killed by frost and start to grow again. But never a single seed from these genetically damaged plants will develop a normal plant, no reproduction and no evolution.

Some breeders and merchants of seeds have kept exact records during 50 and even more years of pea breeding, concerning many acres of pea seeds per year for the canning and freezing industry, that were meticulously walked over during the development of the crops repeatedly by experts for uniformity control.

NEVER during more than half a century, in more than 50 generations of a variety of peas, between many billions of plants per generation, was ever found a single pea plant with new characteristics - that could be reproduced - and that did not already exist in other pea varieties.

## 11. Natural Selection

It is an obvious mistake to think that one can select new characteristics from a pool of genes, when that characteristic is not already present in that pool. No pearls can be selected from a box with only black, white and red plastic beads. The evolution theory that plastic beads could "evaluate" into pearls is an error. So is the pretended theory about the evolution from ape to man. That idea started with some scientists who observed 37 traits of an ape similar to traits of a man. But to day we know that the differences between apes and human beings are vast: of all the 7 billion men and women on our planet, no two are alike, even twins are not 100% identical.

"Natural Selection" is not a phenomenon in nature that results in new life but on the contrary it is the system that preserves life on our planet in optima forma and perfectly durable so that life on earth could survive in its full complexity and unaltered through the ages since its creation.

No human being is capable to think up and compose a NEW living species of insects, animals or plants, new and different in every aspect of its life cycle, like a butterfly differs from all other types of insects. All man-made "new" creatures are not durable; they will quickly disappear when the breeders stop looking after the reproduction of generations. This is also for breeders a point of continuous concern: the slightest error or lack of attention will result in serious quality problems: a "degeneration" of the hybrid they produced.

### *Degeneration*

Man made breeds, when left unattended by breeders, will tend to degenerate and loose again their in-bred qualities, such as nicer color, nicer shape, plus whatever the consumers prefer at a certain period. After several generations the breed will be completely degenerated and again identical to its original species. The term "Degeneration" is perhaps plausible but not correct. The original species has survived in the wild since its creation but the man made version cannot survive in the wild. "Regenerate" is may be a better term. For example: Ötzi, the "Iceman", found in South Tirol, who lived about 5500 years ago, could certainly better survive in the wild than most modern men of to day, ca. 200 generations after Ötzi.

## 12. Parasites and Symbiosis of Species

With the evolution theory in hand it is impossible to explain either the existence of the many forms of symbiosis, of two totally different species in nature, that depend totally on one another for their existence together, nor the many different types of parasites that we have in our flora and fauna. Symbiosis is for instance the case of one special species of a bird and one special species of a plant, depending on one another for their existence, unable to survive individually. Or the symbiosis of a certain plant with one particular insect, or the symbiosis of one plant variety with a totally different variety of plant, or the symbiosis of a plant and a special fungus. Our eco system is full of examples of symbiosis. It is totally unrealistic to suppose that each single participant in such forms of symbiosis has evolved individually and separately, in accordance with the evolution theory, by chance, and living together in perfect harmony, from “nothing” to the plants and insects in the symbiosis we know to-day.

The malaria parasite first exists and develops in a form of symbiosis inside a mosquito and becomes a parasite when the mosquito bites a human being. Another mosquito bites the infected human, gets the parasite that then starts the new life cycle in the mosquito.

There are many types of trees that only grow well when there is a certain fungus in the soil that enables the roots of the tree to absorb the necessary nutrients. The flower of a Yucca plant, (*Yucca Filamentosa* or *Palm Lily*), can only be pollinated by the butterfly of the little Yucca Moth (*Tegeticula Alba*) that is specially equipped for that purpose. Biologist dr. Freek Vonk - Leiden University - explained how the cockroach-mosquito does not kill but lames a cockroach with its venom, then lays its eggs in it and the cockroach stays alive till the last mosquito-larvae has left the remains.

Well known is the Mistletoe (*Visca Album*) with 65 different varieties that only grows on a few varieties of trees such as Oak or Poplars and only in certain microclimates. Less well known is the BROOM-RAPE (*Orobancha Egyptica*), with 100 varieties!, a plant without chlorophyll, that must parasite on other plants for chlorophyll. There is also a type of ORCHID (*corralohriza Trifida*) that can only survive when it has a certain type of fungus on its roots.

## 13. The Missing Link

Evolutionists try to make their theory square by using the term “Missing Link”. They believe that with the “Missing Link” they have completed the proof of their theory that man evolved from an ape. But the term does not make any sense at all. Just the words “Missing Link” already cause misunderstanding: By pretending that a “Missing Link” exists the evolutionists consider that their theory from ape to man is closely reasoned, because they think that it implies that: “The Missing Link between ape and men is just lost but it can and will be found”. The reality is that the “Missing Link in the Evolution Theory does not exist: there

is no link, there is no proof at all for the theory that men evolved from apes.

There is further confusion because of the fact that also two basic questions are wrongly presented as one: namely: the origin of all creatures and the origin of life.

Evolutionists pretend they can now explain the evolution from “nothing” via apes to human beings, using the term “Missing Link”. In their reasoning there is no consideration for a divine intervention, always ignoring and leaving unanswered the most important question: *the question about the beginning of life*.

Of course there can be no question of – as suggested – just one link, one “Missing Link” to confirm the theory of evolution: from nothing to our breath taking complex eco system that is genuinely durable and perfectly balanced in all its details, in existence since its creation. On the contrary:

It is obvious that the fossil of one small dinosaur something like wings, the recently discovered *Archeoraptor*, is not the missing link in the evolution of a reptile to an eagle. Just in the pretended evolution from one reptile to another reptile there must have been an incredible number of steps with a vast number of creatures in each step of evolution. The number of missing links between an adder and an eagle is beyond imagination. In the meantime it was established that this *Archeoraptor* never existed and that the “discovery” was a poor joke. It is interesting to point out that the “discovery” of the “Archeoraptor” made headlines at the time in newspapers and magazines all over the world and that the disclosure of the fact that the “discovery of the Archeoraptor” was just a fraud, was only mentioned in a few lines inside some papers.

## 14. Creation and Survival

Phenomenal ways of survival for creatures

Already in a small seed of a plant one can find the complete DNA program of that plant, typical for each species, a program not only for the development of the entire plant, from seed to flower, to fruit and to seed again, but also with the capability to measure the humidity in the soil, the temperature, the light intensity and the time. Also the seed recognizes the composition of the moisture: the seeds of berries or tomatoes do not germinate in the juice of its own fruit. After dropping from the plant on the ground, it takes quite some time until all the juice from the rotting fruit has disappeared completely, preventing that the seeds germinate in the winter, in order to survive the winter and to germinate in spring when the growing conditions for the new seedlings are most favorable. Some seeds only germinate after a period of 30 days at a constant temperature of 30° C. and with a relative humidity of nearly 100%. When there is a drop in the temperature or in the humidity, the counting to 30 days starts over again. (*Strelitzia Regina*). Some seeds react to a high temperature by not germinating when the temperature is above 30° C. As if they are in the desert, waiting for the rain and a drop in temperature at the same time. Other seeds react very strongly to a low temperature: After a cold spell the

normal program for development of the plant is altered in such a way that the plant shortens its normal lifespan. The normal life cycle of a cabbage plant is from April till August the following year. When the seed is given a low temperature treatment and then sown in March, it will produce quickly a smaller plant and will also flower in June, at its normal time, without forming a cabbage first. (*Brassica Oleoraca*).

## 15. Was the Creation of Our Planet Earth and Life Lacking Sufficiency?

According to an increasing number of people, politicians and even scientists, our planet Earth will be too small in the foreseeable future, to provide sufficient living conditions and food for seven billion and in the not too distant future even possibly 10 billion inhabitants. The reasoning behind this opinion appears to be very simple and very true because everybody understands that in a limited space, growth cannot go on forever and must stop one day. However, when looking at the people that support the idea of the earth being too small for its population, we see astronauts, looking for more money for their work in space, we see politicians looking for a reason to raise more taxes and we also see nonbelievers who want to deny the perfection of the work of our Creator.

Men, incapable to add even a single dot to the book of our flora and fauna, is however indeed responsible for the extinction of many species and with the destruction of rain forests many creatures disappear even before ever being discovered. The Romans robbed large numbers of people and animals from Africa, for their arenas round the Mediterranean and damaged the African continent almost beyond repair. The Spaniards and also others demolished very large woods to build their houses and their cities. Enormous quantities of timber were required to build their huge armadas and especially the building of ships required large amounts of timber. They did not have electric sawing machines but the stems of the trees were split with wedges, wasting most of a tree and resulting in very small amounts of timber from very large woods.

Legend has it that once Spain was just one great forest in which a monkey could swing from the Pyrenees to the Mediterranean. Now the woods of Spain have almost completely disappeared, with the flora and fauna that once was part of it. Looking at old maps of France one can see that all of France was once covered with forests, with only here and there a village or a town.

However, finally most people are now convinced of the fact that wasting land, destroying woods, polluting water and spilling resources can reduce the greatest abundance to nothing but fortunately these types of misbehavior have now been banned in many parts of the world. Some people of course get depressed when they see the vast cities that have been developing, especially during the last century and cannot see how one could get poverty and even hunger under control in the world and some think that they can blame the lack of space and the lack of food on our Creator. But the

desire to join large groups is human nature and the larger the cities, the more the attraction, resulting in empty villages and crowded cities. It is also human nature that once living in a large city people start to complain that it is crowded; but only few people return to the country.

The train from Paddington Station in London to the West of England first rolls at moderate speed for half an hour through a sea of houses, flats and factories. Then the train starts to speed up and runs for nearly two hours, at a speed of 100 miles per hour most of the time, through fields and more fields of the undulating countryside of the South of England. The traveller from London to Scotland gets a similar experience: starting from Kings Cross station, the train travels to begin with the best part of an hour at low speed along houses, flats, parks, factories and more houses but then the train runs for hours at 100 miles per hour through the countryside that looks like a huge parkland, towards Doncaster, Edinburgh and beyond, almost without stopping. After the many millions of people living in Greater London, only relatively very few live in the country.

An interesting thought that comes up when experiencing these train journeys is that 100 years ago the steam trains were already covering the same distances and at similar speeds. But the important impression of the parkland scenery from the train is that people obviously want to live together "on a heap" and then think that the whole world is also crowded. Something like flies on a dung heap, they look around and say: "The whole world is a dung heap".

Nowadays many millions of people go by plane on holiday to far away destinations, some even twice in a year. But the majority of the holiday travellers go on arrival direct to their hotel and then straight to the beaches. Many holidaymakers even go after arrival in their hotel, straight to the bingo hall in the basement of the hotel.

When asked to indicate on a large map the position of their hotel, they have no idea, to them geography is a blank subject. Stepping out of a plane after a few hours flight, they have no idea about the distance and do not realize how far they are away from home.

This is the reason why so many believe that our planet is too small and that our civilization is facing the threat of limited space and limited resources. They have no idea about how great our planet is. These people have not learned to look around and do not understand the possibilities of our world when the proper measures are being taken. Most of them have never been on a farm or in a stable. Never walked in an orchard or in a greenhouse with tomatoes or cucumbers. They are totally estranged from life on a farm and have no idea about the way our food is being produced and yet they have a negative opinion about the future of our civilization.

## 16. The Creation of Life on Our Planet Earth was Not Insufficient

Astronauts, returning from their travels through space, tell us that they are deeply impressed by the great splendor of our

living planet, amidst the dead celestial bodies of our solar system and they encourage everybody to work hard to protect and improve our world. Overcrowding in some places and lack of food in other places are not caused by lack of space or lack of resources but these problems are the result of wrong human behavior.

All the land on our planet comprises of about 150 million square kilometers that is 15 billion Hectares or 37 billion acres. With the techniques that are available at present, about 20 % of the land, which is about 7,5 billion acres, is suitable for the production of food for the world because the remainder of the land is too cold, too wet or uninhabitable. At present only about half of this suitable land, some 3,5 billion acres, is actually in use for the production of food, for the 7 billion people on our planet and on the largest part of this good land, the production of food is extremely primitive.

The statement is false: "That we must have per person 2 Hectares or 5 acres of agricultural land for all our needs"; because at this moment the entire population of the world depends on average on the yield of food from one acre per two persons. The extra possibilities for the production of food in and on the seas and oceans, 7 times the surface of land, not been taken into consideration.

Horticultural and agricultural techniques are being developed and improved at a very rapid pace and that is why a very small and very densely populated country like the Netherlands, can be one of the largest producers and exporters of various food products in the world. In a very rapid pace the yields per acre are getting higher and higher and each year more often on land, before considered to be unsuitable for food production.

To day the words: "The sky is the limit" has become a reality for the production of food because the quality and the type of soil is becoming less important almost every day as in many cases now the ground is first leveled and then covered with concrete, to avoid the risk of soil borne diseases. The plants stand in pots or soil blocks on the concrete in a thin layer of water with nutrients that is constantly being recycled and reconditioned.

Also an increasing number of crops are now being grown in layers, one crop on top of another, sometimes even in many layers. Such is the case for instance with mushrooms and also with chicory, Belgian endive. Already years ago General Electric had in Epcot Centre in Orlando Florida a demonstration with the production of fruit and vegetables in large sea-containers that could be piled up, with in each container the production of food in a completely closed circuit, recycling the water and the unused nutrients. It is now possible to produce food on large surfaces, regardless of the type of surface, on top of buildings, under roads, over water and over the sea.

In the course of only one generation the total production per m<sup>2</sup> of several crops has been increased TENFOLD from 7 to 75 kilo, while at the same time the use of labor, water, energy and fertilizer has been reduced to the minimum and the use of insecticides and pesticides in these crops to nil.

## 17. Postscript

The meaning of the previous lines is not to prove the existence of the creation and the Creator because that is accepted by anyone who looks with interest and awe at the flora and fauna around him and realizes that it is about concepts beyond imagination that we experience, like eternal, without beginning, without ending, almighty and omnipresent. The meaning of this manuscript is to explain that Darwinists have no proof at all for their belief that the "Origin of Life" was just by chance and the "Origin of Species" the result of spontaneous "Mutations and Natural Selection".

According to some atheists the Creation is unbelievable. Instead they believe that: "First there was nothing; then the nothing exploded and there was by chance the universe, then by chance there was life and then again by chance there were people." And they call their belief: "Science".

## 18. Conclusions

### 18.1. Conclusion 1/11

Darwin mistook the changes he observed in his finches, which adapted themselves to the changing surroundings, as on-going changes, resulting in time in a total transformation and a new species: "Evolution and Origin of Species". But on the contrary: the possibility of a species to adjust itself to changing circumstances is within the limits already fixed in its genome: a finch will always remain a finch, can change its looks but cannot evolve in a pigeon. A finch can grow larger or smaller, change its colors and develop a larger or smaller bill but it will never become a "new" bird or a "new" species. In reality the capability of a species to adjust itself to changing surroundings, is a created characteristic of the species, not for evolution into something else but for the perfect and lasting unchanged SURVIVAL of the species. Minor details of its appearance may change but the species will remain the same through the ages. Our pigeons, ants, bees, sheep and lions and also we are all identical to our ancestors, no evolution!

### 18.2. Conclusion 2.5.

When Darwin mentioned the "Species" that he studied and compared, it was not about eagles and sparrows but about slight differences in representatives of the same kind of a sub-species of an under sort of finches.

### 18.3. Conclusion 3.9.

"Survival of the fittest" means that there must have been many generations of a single variety, with very large numbers of individuals in each generation, with little steps of (positive) change between each generation. No traces of these very vast numbers have ever been found.

### 18.4. Conclusion 4.5.

The possibility of evolution in species – the possibility to adapt to changing environments – does not explain the origin



of all species nor the origin of life – but is a created condition for the optimal and durable *survival* of species.

#### 18.5. Conclusion 5.3.

The unique trees and plants on Lord Howe Island did not come from elsewhere and for evolution and natural selection there has been no space and no time on that “new” island.

#### 18.6. Conclusion 6.5.

When during 50 generations, with many billions of individuals in each generation, there is nothing that even remotely resembles evolution, in the sense of “New life developing”, we must conclude that that also never has been the case in the earlier many generations. For this reason the pretended role of mutants in evolution is impossible.

#### 18.7. Conclusion 7.6.

On the many millions of acres of seed crops, documented by seed breeders during more than a century, NEVER any plants have been found with any signs of NATURAL SELECTION and evolution, with NEW heritable characteristics that did not already exist in our eco system.

#### 18.8. Conclusion 8.2.

It requires a huge number of missing links, a number of missing links beyond imagination, between all the little steps of a suggested lower species of evolution to a sub species, all the little steps between all the different stages of evolution in a sub species to a species and then all the little steps of evolution in each species of plants, insects and animals; from nothing to our present flora and fauna. None of these “Missing links” have ever been found.

#### 18.9. Conclusion 9.2.

The programs for survival in emergencies, fixed in the DNA of the seeds of many plant species, cannot be explained with evolution: it is about survival in very abnormal situations or conditions, that occur only very rarely, with the phenomenon that part of the normal plant cycle is reduced or even skipped, in order to reach later much better circumstances for the production of offspring and the survival of a new generation. A plant species cannot adjust itself with evolution and natural selection to such abnormal circumstances. Without having first the program for survival, there would not have been any survival at all.

#### 18.10. Conclusion 10.3.

Our planet can amply provide for all life on earth, now and in the future. Shortages are the result of greed and mismanagement.

## 19. Summary

Darwin was inaccurate: Darwin and also his editor overlooked to explain what he exactly meant with “species”.

Darwin studied for example: a particular strain of a particular sort of the finches – a particular sort of birds. However his followers misunderstood that it was about all birds and misunderstood that it was also valid for all species.

Darwin misunderstood that the differences in looks he noticed in his birds were genotypic characteristics, permanent and fixed in the genes; in fact they were phenotypic characteristics and change with differences in the environment.

Darwin did not test his philosophy by returning his finches to their original habitat. He would then have noticed his error of judgment.

“Natural selection” is a recombination of genes that already exist. Natural selection cannot result in new life. Natural selection is about survival of the best fit. NOT resulting in NEW life but to preserve existing life in optima forma.

“Mutants” have a damaged genome, are therefore sterile and cannot contribute to new forms of life.

Evolution, with natural selection is not about the ORIGIN OF LIFE but about the CONSERVATION of life, conservation of our eco system; creatures are capable to and will adjust themselves to their constantly changing living conditions, remaining the same species.

The creation is the perfect example of durability: all creatures co-exist unchanged since the time that the creation was complete. No trace of “Missing Links”, no trace of evolution. “À TOI LA GLOIRE!”

---

## References

- [1] Charles Darwin, ed. J. W. Burrow 1968 “The Origin of Species”
- [2] Dr. H. H. Zouteveen 1888 “Darwin’s Masterpieces” “Variation of Domestic animals and plants.”
- [3] E. Lovelock 1979 “Gaia, a new look at life on Earth”
- [4] “Darwin” Jonathan Howard, ed. K. Thomas 1982 “Darwin”
- [5] Peter Skelton. “Evolution” The Open University 1993
- [6] Lynn Margulis “The illustrated five Kingdoms” Science writers 1994
- [7] Michael White 1995 “Darwin, a Life in Science
- [8] vars Peterson 1998 “The Jungles of Randomness”
- [9] Barbara Continenza. “Darwin, Biography” Scienze S.p.A. 1998.
- [10] Winkler Prins 1998. “Encarta”
- [11] Sato et al 1999 ‘Evolution’
- [12] Prof. Dr. A. Brouwer 2002 « History of the Evolution theory »
- [13] Prof. S. Conway Morris 2002 ‘The Human being is no accident’
- [14] Prof. Lynn Margulis 2002 “Endosymbiosis”

- [15] Richard Dawkins 2004. "The Ancestor's Tale"
- [16] Alister McGrath 2005 "Dawkins God"
- [17] Don Batten C.S. "The Creation Answers Book" 2006
- [18] Francis S. Collins "The Language of God" 2006
- [19] Batten, Sarfati, Wieland, Catchpole "The Creation Answers Book" 2009
- [20] Norman L. Geisler, Frank Turek "I don't have enough faith to be an atheist" 2004