

The Miracle of Talking Birds

**Do you not see that everyone in the heavens
and Earth glorifies God, as do the birds with
their outspread wings? Each one knows its
prayer and glorification...
(Qur'an, 24:41)**

HARUN YAHYA

Idara Isha'at-E-Diniyat (P) Ltd.

The Miracle of Talking Birds

Translated by Valerie Needham

Edited by Tam Mossman

ISBN:

Published by:

IDARA ISHA'AT-E-DINIYAT (P) LTD.

168/2, Jha House, Hazrat Nizamuddin

New Delhi-110 013 (India)

Tel.: 26926832, 26926833

Fax: +91-11-26322787

Email: **sales@idara.com**

Visit us at: **www.idara.com**

All translations from the Qur'an are from *The Noble Qur'an: a New Rendering of its Meaning in English* by Hajj Abdalhaqq and Aisha Bewley, published by Bookwork, Norwich, UK. 1420 CE/1999 AH.

www.harunyahya.com

info@harunyahya.com

Contents

Foreword

Introduction

The Blind Coincidences that the Darwinists Believe to be Rational

Chapter -1-

The Special Design Which Enables Birds to Produce Sound

Chapter -2-

The High Level of Consciousness in Birds that Imitate Sounds

Chapter -3-

Birds that Imitate Sound Invalidate Evolutionary Theory

Conclusion

The Deception of Evolution

To the Reader

A special chapter is assigned to the collapse of the theory of evolution because this theory constitutes the basis of all anti-spiritual philosophies. Since Darwinism rejects the fact of creation—and therefore, God's Existence—over the last 140 years it has caused many people to abandon their faith or fall into doubt. It is therefore an imperative service, a very important duty to show everyone that this theory is a deception. Since some readers may find the chance to read only one of our book, we think it appropriate to devote a chapter to summarize this subject.

All the author's books explain faith-related issues in light of Qur'anic verses, and invite readers to learn God's words and to live by them. All the subjects concerning God's verses are explained so as to leave no doubt or room for questions in the reader's mind. The books' sincere, plain, and fluent style ensure that everyone of every age and from every social group can easily understand them. Thanks to their effective, lucid narrative, they can be read at a one sitting. Even those who rigorously reject spirituality are influenced by the facts these books document and cannot refute the truthfulness of their contents.

This and all the other books by the author can be read individually, or discussed in a group. Readers eager to profit from the books will find discussion very useful, letting them relate their reflections and experiences to one another.

In addition, it will be a great service to Islam to contribute to the publication and reading of these books, written solely for the pleasure of God. The author's books are all extremely convincing. For this reason, to communicate true religion to others, one of the most effective methods is encouraging them to read these books.

We hope the reader will look through the reviews of his other books at the back of this book. His rich source material on faith-related issues is very useful, and a pleasure to read.

In these books, unlike some other books, you will not find the author's personal views, explanations based on dubious sources, styles that are unobservant of the respect and reverence due to sacred subjects, nor hopeless, pessimistic arguments that create doubts in the mind and deviations in the heart.

About the Author

Now writing under the pen-name of HARUN YAHYA, he was born in Ankara in 1956. Having completed his primary and secondary education in Ankara, he studied arts at Istanbul's Mimar Sinan University and philosophy at Istanbul University. Since the 1980s, he has published many books on political, scientific, and faith-related issues. Harun Yahya is well-known as the author of important works disclosing the imposture of evolutionists, their invalid claims, and the dark liaisons between Darwinism and such bloody ideologies as fascism and communism.

His pen-name is a composite of the names *Harun* (Aaron) and *Yahya* (John), in memory of the two esteemed Prophets who fought against their people's lack of faith. The Prophet's seal on the his books' covers is symbolic and is linked to the their contents. It represents the Qur'an (the final scripture) and the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), last of the prophets. Under the guidance of the Qur'an and the Sunnah (teachings of the Prophet), the author makes it his purpose to disprove each fundamental tenet of godless ideologies and to have the "last word," so as to completely silence the objections raised against religion. He uses the seal of the final Prophet, who attained ultimate wisdom and moral perfection, as a sign of his intention to offer the last word.

All of Harun Yahya's works share one single goal: to convey the Qur'an's message, encourage readers to consider basic faith-related issues such as God's Existence and Unity and the hereafter; and to expose godless systems' feeble foundations and perverted ideologies.

Harun Yahya enjoys a wide readership in many countries, from India to America, England to Indonesia, Poland to Bosnia, and Spain to Brazil. Some of his books are available in English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Urdu, Arabic, Albanian, Russian, Serbo-Croat (Bosnian), Polish, Malay, Uygur Turkish, and Indonesian.

Greatly appreciated all around the world, these works have been instrumental in many people recovering faith in God and gaining deeper insights into their faith. His books' wisdom and sincerity, together with a distinct style that's easy to understand, directly affect anyone who reads them. Those who seriously consider these books, can no longer advocate atheism or any other perverted ideology or materialistic philosophy, since these books are characterized by rapid effectiveness, definite results, and irrefutability. Even if they continue to do so, it will be only a sentimental insistence, since these books refute such ideologies from their very foundations. All contemporary movements of denial are now ideologically defeated, thanks to the books written by Harun Yahya.

This is no doubt a result of the Qur'an's wisdom and lucidity. The author modestly intends to serve as a means in humanity's search for God's right path. No material gain is sought in the publication of these works.

Those who encourage others to read these books, to open their minds and hearts and guide them to become more devoted servants of God, render an invaluable service.

Meanwhile, it would only be a waste of time and energy to propagate other books that create confusion in people's minds, lead them into ideological chaos, and that clearly have no strong and precise effects in removing the doubts in people's hearts, as also verified from previous experience. It is impossible for books devised to emphasize the author's literary power rather than the noble goal of saving people from loss of faith, to have such a great effect. Those who doubt this can readily see that the sole aim of Harun Yahya's books is to overcome disbelief and to disseminate the Qur'an's moral values. The success and impact of this service are manifested in the readers' conviction.

One point should be kept in mind: The main reason for the continuing cruelty, conflict, and other ordeals endured by the vast majority of people is the ideological prevalence of disbelief. This can be ended only with the ideological defeat of disbelief and by conveying the wonders of creation and Qur'anic morality so that people can live by it. Considering the state of the world today, leading into a downward spiral of violence, corruption and conflict, clearly this service must be provided speedily and effectively, or it may be too late.

In this effort, the books of Harun Yahya assume a leading role. By the will of God, these books will be a means through which people in the twentyfirst century will attain the peace, justice, and happiness promised in the Qur'an.

FOREWORD

Each and every species on Earth has been created with miraculous characteristics and wondrous skills. Even in one single living species, we can find abundant proof of God's magnificent creation.

According to one verse of the Qur'an:

There is no creature crawling on the Earth or flying creature, flying on its wings, who are not communities just like yourselves—We have not omitted anything from the Book—then they will be gathered to their Lord. (Qur'an, 6:38)

This verse draws our attention to birds which, of all living creatures, are worthy of special consideration and observation.

There are approximately ten thousand different species of birds, many of which have miraculous characteristics. Wherever we live, we may encounter many of these creatures and can admire the different aspects of each variety. They exhibit countless examples of the evidence of creation, through their aesthetic appearance, their perfect flying mechanisms, their expertise in migration, their nest-making skills and their self-sacrificing behavior.

Meanwhile, other species of birds are created with a special aptitude for forming social groups. Many varieties live together as a community, warn one another of danger, work collectively to find food and shelter, and make various sacrifices to help each other out in any number of ways. (For detailed information, see Harun Yahya, *Devotion Among Animals: Revealing the Work of God*). As God pointed out in the Qur'an, these creatures are capable of establishing their own form of communication and performing in cooperative ways the duties inspired in them by God.

Some birds distinguish themselves by their superior intelligence and special talents. These particular species are the subject matter of this book and which we may define as birds that can imitate sounds, include the parrots, songbirds, and hummingbirds. Many of us have heard about, seen on television or even personally witnessed these birds' ability to talk. However, we may not have considered what a great miracle it is that these creatures can mimic in this way, or to the perfection of the way in which God has created them.

This book explains how these creatures' being hatched with their ability to talk or imitate sounds is one of the miracles of creation and, at the same time, how this very ability invalidates the claims of evolutionary theory. And so, we will display the magnificence of God's creation for all to see.

Introduction

The Blind Coincidences that the Darwinists Believe to Be Rational

Before examining the perfection of the systems that allow birds to talk, first it's worth dwelling on the invalid assumption of "coincidence," the foundation of all the hypotheses in evolutionary theory. Doing so will make it easier to see through the highly illogical claim that the remarkable characteristics of the creatures cited in this book are simply the product of coincidences.

The noun *coincidence* is typically modified by such adjectives as *unconscious*, *disorderly*, *unplanned* and *random*. These words imply no conscious power, system, rationality, nor any source of knowledge. They express the occurrence of unplanned situations, and spontaneous events with no specific purpose.

But look at how the word *coincidence* is used in Darwinist-materialist circles, and you'll encounter somewhat different definitions. Scientists who defend the Darwinist-materialist philosophy link to the word *coincidence* meanings that should rightly be attributed to Creation, such as *consciousness*, *rationality*, *knowledge*, and *plan*. They speak about coincidence as though it were referring to a powerful sentient being. Their purpose in all this is to deny the reality that living creatures have been created.

R. C. Sproul, author of *Not A Chance*, explains the unrealistic "scientific" meaning that *coincidence* has acquired in Darwinist circles:

When scientists attribute instrumental power to chance, they have left the domain of physics and resorted to magic. Chance is their magic wand to make not only rabbits but entire universes appear out of nothing.¹

Overlooking the reality of creation despite immeasurable scientific proof, and continuing to defend their ideology with great fanaticism, they do not realize how wrong they are. How far they have distanced themselves from reason and logic! In his work *La Science et la réalité* (Science and Reality), French scientist and Professor Pierre Delbet has this to say about the fallacy of attributing creative power to coincidence:

Chance appears today as a law, the most general of all laws. It has become for me a soft pillow like the one which in Montaigne's words only ignorance and disinterest can provide, but this is a scientific pillow.²

In reality, the concept of "coincidence," which Darwinists use as a scientific explanation for life's origins expresses randomness, uncertainty, and lack of purpose. Therefore, to claim that a perfect system and a perfect balance are the product of these "blind coincidences" is incompatible with reason, logic and the scientific method. To suggest that an existing design is "without purpose," or to try and explain a functioning system with "chance happenings" is plain denial.

To illustrate the impossibility of Darwinist scientists' claim that life is the product of coincidence, just think of a huge warehouse filled with various electronic devices, circuitry, cables and wiring. What if we wait for these various parts to assemble themselves into a computer? How long, do you think, would it take for those parts to start fitting themselves together as the result of a "coincidence"? How probable is it? Independent parts have no knowledge of what kind of structure they will form when they are put together. Of course, they have no idea of their basic purpose—to produce a functioning computer. However long you wait, this illusionary scenario will remain impossible to achieve.

No one doubts that some conscious being's intervention is required for these components to assemble themselves into some kind of design. In such a situation, the effects of coincidence would do no more than to upset whatever order already exists. If it's irrational to dwell on the likelihood of mechanical parts coming together into even a single computer as a result of uncontrolled effects, it's even more highly irrational to suggest that countless living creatures possessing complex systems, whose every organ is composed of scores of essential parts, could be the product of coincidence.

Michael J. Behe, a famous professor of biochemistry, expressed his astonishment to colleagues who see coincidence as the law of the order and the diversity that we encounter:

Chance is of course chance, but law in this context we can see as Darwinian evolution. Although we conclude that some features of the cell have been designed, many may have arisen gradually through mutation or natural selection. Only if we rule out chance and law can we move on to conclude that a feature was designed.³

As we have pointed out, Darwinists see "coincidence" as the principle that has created all living creatures, their complex anatomical structures and genetic information. They believe that acts that in reality require forms of intelligence—such as calculation, planning, design and judgment—are brought to a successful conclusion by coincidences. Defenders of this absurd understanding attribute extraordinary roles and meanings to "coincidence." According to them, the power that fashioned the brains, the minds, thinking and reasoning ability, memories, appearances and other characteristics of all those who have ever lived, for hundreds of thousands of years, is a genius by the name of "coincidence." According to this ridiculous claim, those professors who make discoveries and solve complex physical equations, those artists who create valuable works of art, those statesmen who lead millions of citizens are brought into existence through unconscious coincidences. According to Darwinists, the only things that blind coincidence needs to bring about such extraordinary events are the mechanism called "natural selection" and time. According to this warped logic, all coincidence needs is time, to turn black mud into birds, horses, giraffes, butterflies—and even scientists, politicians and painters. There is absolutely no scientific evidence to support these claims, which resemble a fantastic, irrational science fiction yarn.

To date, we have published several books dealing with the subject of evolution. In several, we have mentioned the various wonders of creation that invalidate these totally illogical claims. This present book will take up one of the important pieces of evidence of creation, birds' ability to talk and imitate sounds. Here, we'll display the serious logical flaws in the arguments produced by evolutionists, who lead themselves up the blind alley of coincidence. And we'll make clear for all to see the impasse in which they find themselves.

Chapter -1-

The Special Design which Enables Birds to Produce Sound

Talking, or even imitating sound, is not just a simple matter of opening and closing the mouth, as some people believe. A complex system is required for this action to take place, and all parts of this system must be synchronized in perfect working order. Birds with a talent for sound mimicry enjoy all of these requirements and demonstrate their ability in extraordinary ways.

Some of these species have a talent rarely found in any other creature except man. The best example of this are parrots, which can imitate, in addition to human speech, a wide range of sounds that even humans can't duplicate convincingly—for example, as the creaking of a door, the cap being removed from a bottle, a ringing telephone, or a tune being whistled. This talent to imitate, observable in parrots and some other bird species, is not an ability that can be acquired by coincidence. For any living creature to imitate a sound it has heard, it needs to have complex physiological structures already in place. Particularly in the case of birds that can closely imitate the human voice in terms of tone, stress and expression, these structures must be very sophisticated.

For a bird to reproduce a word or a melody it has heard, it needs to have an appropriate physical structure. Its sense of hearing must be functioning perfectly, and it must be able to memorize the information received by the senses and the ability to conceptualize meaning in its own terms.

People are astonished the first time they hear a parrot say "Hello!" when the phone rings, ask "Who is it?" when the doorbell rings, or greet someone familiar by name. But even though it's an astonishing achievement for a bird to say even one word, many don't really give it due consideration. Over time, they may even come to see it as normal and commonplace.

Not only does the bird see and recognize the person approaching; what's more, the bird knows how to react to a person it knows. It remembers—and reproduces—words it associates with that person. This is evident proof that the bird has an accurate memory. If we consider that some species of birds seem to understand questions they are asked and give a seemingly logical answer, the issue becomes even more complex. One important example of this is a trained grey parrot by the name of Alex. When he's presented with a red (rose) piece of paper and asked "What color?" he answers "rose."⁴ In later sections, we'll mention more of this parrot's skills in more detail.

A bird possessing such talents is a great wonder of creation, for birds and other animals do not have free will and reason, and do not share the human characteristics of thought, the ability to make conscious decisions and the determination to carry them out. The ability to talk and imitate sounds is taught by God to certain species of birds. These creatures do not talk because of their own rational thought, will or consciousness, but through God's inspiration. In a verse of the Qur'an, God conveys that He is supreme over all living creatures: **"... There is no creature He does not hold by the forelock..."** (Qur'an, 11:56) All the wondrous characteristics of birds that can imitate sounds are just part of the evidence God shows to man so we may witness the magnificence of His creation.

The Physical Formation of Sound in Birds

You might assume that in order for a parrot to be able to imitate the human voice—to use a person's same spoken words, stresses and pronunciation—they must possess a larynx whose structure is similar to a human's. However, the structure of the human larynx bears no resemblance to these creatures' physical structures. The larynx, vocal cords, tongue, lips, palate and teeth that humans use in speech are completely different in birds, and some do not exist at all. But even though all birds lack these structures, still these species can reproduce phrases spoken by humans—and in the same tones. If we consider that a person without a tongue is unable to speak or that we lose our voice if the vocal cords are damaged, it's also worth considering that parrots, budgerigars, and mynahs, members of the crow family, have completely different physical characteristics which nevertheless enable them to talk in the same way as humans.

There are other differences between the systems that humans and birds use to produce vocal sounds. We produce most sounds by expelling air from the lungs through the larynx. Different sounds are created, according to the degree of vibration of the vocal cords. The position of the tongue and lips and the flow of air through the mouth or nasal cavity are only a few of the many other factors affecting sound production. The pharynx, found in humans, lets the tongue divide the vocal tract above the larynx into two cavities with their own distinct resonances. Where these resonances occur, the overtones of the frequencies (or number of vibrations) from the vocal cords are amplified. Formants (from the Latin *formare*: to shape, or form) are resonant frequencies of the vocal tract, the natural shapes that air assumes in the vocal passage. When you make a consonant, for example, this has an effect on the formants of the neighbouring vowels, raising or lowering formants as the vowel sound gets closer to the consonant. Experiments have shown that two formants are sufficient in order to differentiate speech sounds from each other.⁵

Birds have no larynx similar to a human's, but do have a special vocal organ, known as the syrinx, that enables them to produce sounds. In birds, air from the lungs passes

through this organ. In a sense, the bird's syrinx is the equivalent of our human larynx. One of the principal differences is that in humans, our vocal cords are positioned closer to the windpipe. So far, the fact that the bird's syrinx is deep inside the body has prevented scientists from obtaining a complete answer as to how birds produce sound. Scientists have filmed birds using infra-red and x-ray cameras, and have made close studies of their song and speech by means of fiber-optic microscopes inserted in their throats. Yet we still cannot explain the physical process by which birds produce song and imitate sounds.

Within the bird's breast, its vocal organ is like a branched instrument, located at where its voice box meets the two bronchial tubes. As shown on the adjacent page, one branch of the syrinx opens into one bronchus and the second branch into the other; and either one of these two bronchi can produce sound. Some birds can use either both sides of their voice organ simultaneously, or one of the two independently and, by this means, can produce two separate tones of the same frequency, at the same time. They can sing a high note with one side, while producing a low note with the other. And since the bird's vocal organ is situated at the juncture of the two bronchial tubes, it can produce sound from two different sources. This even allows the bird to produce two different notes simultaneously, and even to sing a duet with itself. To a great extent, sounds produced here are subsequently combined, giving birds the potential of creating rich melodies. While humans use only about 2% of the air they inhale to produce sound, birds have the ability to use it all.⁶

The syrinx is located in a pouch within the clavicle below the bird's throat. The membrane covering this pouch is sensitive to the air coming from the lungs, and its elasticity and complexity of the membrane are factors that determine the quality of sounds. The sound quality is also affected by the length of the windpipe, the constriction of the voice box, the neck muscles, structure of the beak, and their respective movements. In short, the complexity of the birds' syrinx determines the complexity of the sounds they produce. Its muscles affect the air flow and consequently, the quality of the sound. In parrots, budgerigars, and some songbirds, the syrinx has a greater number of muscles, and its structure is more complex.

Furthermore, the different techniques that parrots and budgerigars employ for imitating the human voice are most effective. Like humans, parrots have thick tongues that enable them to produce sounds resembling ours. Sound is produced by blowing air through two separate places in their syrinx, and at the same time producing the independent sounds required to produce consonants. The initial sound from the syrinx is shaped with the help of the throat, and then in the mouth with the tongue. In their research studies with grey parrots, Dianne Patterson and Irene Pepperberg reached important conclusions on vowel production: Due to the radically different anatomy of this parrot's vocal organ, even though they lack teeth and lips, they can produce sounds that closely resemble sounds produced by humans.⁷ Indeed, parrots and budgerigars can

quite clearly imitate sounds such as “m” and “b,” which we normally produce with the help of our lips.

Budgerigars, however, due to their small size, are not able to use the same technique as parrots. Using their syrinx to create frequencies from 2,000 to 3,000 Hz, they then add on a second vibration. This system is known as frequency modulation or FM, the principle behind the AM (amplitude modulation) radios to be found in practically every home. These days, many FM broadcasting stations add low transmitters to their signals which, in common with normal signals, are adjustable through a transmitter, but are of a very high frequency. While the frequency of normal signals varies from 20 to 20,000 Hz, the frequency of many low transmitters starts at 56,000 Hz. The main reason for using the FM system is to offset the major disadvantage of the AM system—namely, the interference of many natural or man-made radio sounds, called “parasites.” Because the weak signals of AM radio are quieter than the stronger ones, differences in signal level are formed, which are then perceived as noise. AM receivers have no facility for cutting out these parasitic sounds.

To solve this problem, Edwin H. Armstrong invented a system for eliminating noise caused by the power of the waves. Instead of changing the transmission signal or the strength of the transmitter, he changed the frequency of sound waves per second. Thanks to this system, the amplitude of noise (strength of sound waves) could be reduced to a minimum. But scientists are still mystified how budgerigars manage to use this same system.

Of course, no little budgerigar can possibly work out for itself from the time it is hatched how to apply a series of principles discovered by man only after long trials. In the same way, no parrot can know that it must produce auxiliary sounds in order to make consonants distinct or to develop systems in its throat to enable it to do so. Also, it’s not possible for such a system to be the end product of a series of blind coincidences. All these complex systems we have seen are without doubt, the work of God, the Creator.

Birds’ Sense of Hearing

For birds to display their talents in communicating by sound, song and in the case of some birds, words, they require excellent hearing. At critical times in their lives, their sense of hearing becomes particularly important. Experiments have shown that in order for birds to learn their species’ song, they need an auditory feedback system. Thanks to this system, young birds learn to compare the sounds they produce themselves with the patterns of a song they have memorized. If they were deaf, it wouldn’t normally be possible for them to sing recognizable songs.⁸

Birds’ ears are well equipped for hearing, but they hear in a different way from us. For them to recognize a tune, they have to hear it in always the same octave (a series of seven notes), whereas we can recognize a tune even if we hear it in a different octave. Birds cannot, but can instead recognize timbre—a fundamental note combined with

harmonies. The ability to recognize timbre and harmonic variations lets birds hear and reply to many diverse sounds, and sometimes even reproduce them.

Birds can also hear shorter notes than we can. Humans process sounds in bytes in about 1/20th of a second⁹, whereas birds can distinguish these sounds in 1/200th of a second, which means that birds are superior at separating sounds that arrive in very rapid succession.¹⁰ In other words, a bird's capacity to perceive sound is approximately ten times greater, and in every note heard by a human, it can hear ten.¹¹ Moreover, some birds are also able to hear lower sounds than we are. Their hearing sensitivity is so finely tuned that they can even tell the difference between pieces by such famous composers as Bach and Stravinsky.

Birds' extremely sensitive hearing functions perfectly. Clearly, each of this sense's components is created by special design, for if any one failed to work properly, the bird would not be able to hear anything. This point also disproves the theory that hearing evolved or emerged gradually, as a result of coincidental influences.

Chapter -2-

The High Level of Consciousness in Birds that Imitate Sounds

Birds, and in particular the group we have referred to as “sound imitators,” have an astonishing talent for mimicry. This demonstrates that these creatures have a definite consciousness, for in order to use their talent, birds have to know what they want to imitate, the word’s stress and intonation, evaluate its timing very carefully and then make a number of adjustments. Moreover, a bird must have a good memory to be able to remember and repeat the sounds it has heard.

At this point, it shouldn’t be overlooked that mimicry is a skill that even the majority of intelligent, conscious people do not possess. It is impossible or somewhat difficult for many of us to imitate songs or sounds we’ve heard in a way that’s true to the original. People who are talented mimics attract much attention and are praised for their keen powers of observation. But all members of a given species of parrot use their skills of mimicry effortlessly—another indication that they possess consciousness.

It should be pointed out, however, that the “consciousness” possessed by birds does not resemble ours. Man has skills that no other living creatures have such as the ability to think, make comparisons, understand, learn, draw conclusions from what we’ve learned, and use that knowledge for innovation. Above all, man is a being who is answerable to God for his deeds. In a verse of the Qur’an, God conveys the following:

It is He Who created the heavens and the Earth in six days when His Throne was on the water, in order to test which of you has the best actions... (Qur’an, 11:7)

As the verse says, man is responsible to God:

Then [He] formed him and breathed His Spirit into him and gave you hearing, sight and hearts... (Qur’an, 32:9)

This conveys that man is given a “soul” by God, and will have to account for his deeds in this world. Birds and other animals do not have this responsibility; they merely have to carry out the tasks God has inspired in them and are instruments through which we may witness His supreme power. In a verse of the Qur’an, God declares the following:

Do you not see that everyone in the heavens and Earth glorifies God, as do the birds with their outspread wings? Each one knows its prayer and glorification. God knows what they do. (Qur'an, 24:41)

The Skills of Understanding and Learning in Birds

Of all the talking birds, the African grey parrot is known to be the most talented in respect to understanding and learning. Next come the Amazon parrots, especially yellow napes, the blue fronts, red loreds, and the double yellowheads. Macaws also have vocal learning, but usually vocalize in a loud and rough manner. Unlike the macaw, the cockatoo, another of the parrots with vocal learning, has a sweet voice. But neither species can be taught as easily as the African grey parrots or the Amazons. Mynahs are also known to be particularly good at speaking. One mynah, for example, when approached by a child, can say "Hello." And if the child responds with the same greeting, the bird can ask, "How are you?" Even more interesting, it can continue by asking, "What's your name?"¹²

One of parrots' striking abilities is that they can relate their speech to subjects or movements. For example, a parrot greeted with "Good morning" every time the cover is taken off the cage can, one morning when the cover is removed, say the phrase of its own accord. You have probably heard from several owners that their birds can say, "Hello" when the phone rings or "Who is it?" when someone rings the doorbell. What's more, most birds can do this without being taught, since they can make connections between events and what is said at the time.

For a long time, it was believed that parrots and other talking birds simply imitate what they hear, but recent research has shown that these creatures have surprising cognitive abilities. Only recently have scientists begun to understand the complexity of the bird's communication system. Studies conducted since 1977 by Professor Irene Pepperberg on the subject of animal behavior and animal-human communications give detailed information about birds' skills in speaking and comprehension. In one of her most important works, the study was conducted with four African Grey Parrots. The oldest of them, "Alex," could communicate with the researchers, use specific words, express his wishes, knew the concepts of "same" and "different," could count and identify objects, colors, shapes and materials.¹³ According to scientists, these skills were not automatic, but the results of learning, which in turn is a sign of a high level of consciousness.¹⁴ Naturally this is the inspiration of God. It is ridiculous to imagine that a small piece of flesh composed of insentient atoms can exhibit such complex talents of its own accord. God shows us His incomparable creative art in the talents He has inspired in living creatures.

We will describe in greater detail the work of Professor Pepperberg and use some examples of Alex's behavior to show what a parrot is capable of doing. If we generalize about his skills, not only can he produce and comprehend sentences, but he also understands concepts of category, "same/different," absence, quantity, color and size. He can tell whether one object is different from another, and whether there is such an object in the room.¹⁵

- Alex has learned the names of more than 40 objects: paper, key, nut, wood, wheat, truck, "hide" (rawhide chips), "peg wood" (clothespins), grain, cork, corn, walnut, block, box, "showah" (shower), banana, pasta, gym, cracker, "scraper" (nail file), popcorn, chain, kiwi, shoulder, "rock" (a lava stone beak conditioner), carrot, gravel, cup, citrus, back, chair, chalk, water, nail, grape, grate, treat, cherry, wool, green bean, and "banerry" (apple).

- He has functional use of "no," phrases such as "Come here," "I want—," and "Wanna go—" using appropriate names for objects or locations.

- He has also acquired attributes. He can identify seven colors, "rose" (red), blue, green, yellow, orange, grey, and purple.

- He can name five different shapes as two-, three-, four, five -, or six-cornered objects. He uses "two," "three," "four," "five," and "sih" (six) to distinguish quantities, including groups of unfamiliar items, heterogeneous collections, and sets in which objects are arrayed at random.

- Alex has a limited comprehension of "category." He has learned, for example, not only that "green" is one example of the category "color," but also that for a particularly colored and shaped object, "green" and "three-corner" represent two of its different attributes. Thus he categorizes such objects with respect to either attribute based on our vocal query of "What color?" or "What shape?" Because the same object can be the subject of either a shape or a color question at different times, Alex must be able to change his basis for classification. Such an ability to reclassify is thought to indicate the presence of "abstract aptitude."

- He can request or refuse more than 100 objects, categorize and count them, and combine adjectives with the names. In tests evaluating this skill, he has a success rate of 80%.

- Alex has also learned to answer questions concerning abstract concepts, such as "same" and "different." For example, when shown two objects of the same color, shape or material, he knows which category the objects have in common, or in which category they are different. Or if the objects have no category in common, he is able to answer "none."

- The studies also showed that Alex can give the right answers in regard to nouns, colors, shapes and materials not used in training sessions. For example, he can give the correct answer to the question of "What's the same?" when presented with a green triangular piece of wood and a blue one.

- If a trainer hands Alex something different from what he asked for, Alex usually says "No" and repeats his original request. Moreover, he can correctly say which of two objects is the larger or the smaller. If they're the same size, he answers, "None."

- Given a series of objects of different shapes and colors, Alex can say how many of them are, for example, green triangles or blue squares. Able to sort different bottle tops according to size, he can also combine words to say "I want a green nut" or express wishes in simple sentences such as, "Come here."

- To study the parrot's conceptualization ability, Alex was asked, "What color is object X?" Out of 100 objects of different shapes, colors, and materials, he has a success rate of 81.3% in answering correctly. His correct answers show that he understands all the elements of the question and chooses the right answer by obtaining the required information from objects he is shown.

As Alex's example shows, parrots given the necessary training can memorize fairly long sentences, use them appropriately, and use them to reply to various questions. In addition, they can recognize various words and combine them appropriately. Nowadays, parrots are rated along with dolphins and whales as possessing a high level of intelligence. About the intelligence and talents of parrots, *The Augusta Chronicle* has this to say :

New research suggests that parrots, like chimps and dolphins, are capable of mastering complex intellectual concepts that children cannot handle until age 5.¹⁶

Communication in animals—a dog's bark, for example—is usually innate behavior, not learned. In many species of birds, also, the basic sounds can be instinctive signals, innate and automatic. But the ability to imitate specific sounds is different matter that requires learning. Research shows that in species of birds such as the psittacine group (parrots, crested parrots, budgerigars), corvids (crows, ravens, jays) and the *Cracticidae* (Australian magpies, currawongs, butcherbirds) most vocal skills are learned behavior.¹⁷

We should not forget that these talents do not originate with the creatures in question. It is by God's inspiration that these creatures with no rationality develop learning skills and then store in memory what they learned and use it in context.

SCIENTISTS ARE SURPRISED BY THE INTELLIGENCE MANIFESTED IN BIRDS

Carlio Melo, a brain researcher in Rockefeller University's animal behavior laboratory, says: "... in the beginning of the century up to the 30th and 40th, people believed that the brain of birds were very simple and they were considered primitive. And that created a lot of problems, a lot of prejudice actually. It's funny to think about this in science, but it does happen. ... Birds are very, very intelligent in many ways... That means many birds, particularly those birds that have vocal learning such as song birds, parrots and hummingbirds, they have a very high brain to body ratio... That means these are very, very smart animals." *<http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/s162563.htm>

The Surprising Memory of Birds

Their skills in imitating sound are directly related to birds' ability to recall sounds they have heard. According to the research team at the Free University in Berlin, when conducting research into how a bird imitates sound, the following points should be addressed:

Vocal imitation which is so common in human beings is quite rare in nonhuman organisms. Until now, it has been documented only for a few families of birds (e. g. oscine birds and parrots) and some mammals (e. g. marine mammals and bats). As an inquiry into this accomplishment we study the properties of memory mechanisms that allow individuals to first acquire, then memorize and finally vocally imitate a set of auditorily experienced signal patterns. Our biological model is the Common Nightingale (*Luscinia megarhynchos*). Males of this species are able to auditorily learn and accurately reproduce more than 200 different types of songs. Thus, a central aim of our study is to uncover how these birds successfully cope with complex learning tasks, and how they effectively retrieve their memory-stored data later in life...¹⁸

Birds' have memories of surprisingly high capacity. Not only do they recall the exact location of where they spend their summers and winters, but also the precise location of various foodstuffs they have stored for use in the winter and of plants whose nectar they have drunk. In fact, some birds have longer-term memories than humans. In order to survive cold winter days of heavy snow, some bird species bury thousands of seeds in autumn and remember all of those different places when winter comes, months later. ¹⁹

It's certainly a miracle that a bird has such a capacity for memory and learning. At the same time, this makes nonsense of evolutionists' claims that creatures evolved. Evolutionary theory cannot explain how birds are able to store in memory sounds they

have heard and then use them appropriately. Evolutionary assertions cannot explain how birds have come to possess such a memory. (For detailed information, see the chapter headed “Talking Birds Invalidate Evolutionary Claims”).

It’s not possible for a bird to set up a system for storing what it has learned in its tiny brain. It’s similarly impossible for a special structure to form in a bird’s brain by chance. Birds’ ability to recall sounds and information is just one of the many talents God has granted to these creatures.

Tests Conducted on Talking Birds

God has granted to talking birds some extraordinary talents, as revealed in studies conducted on African Grey parrots (*Psittacus erithacus*) by Professor Irene Pepperberg.

In the course of their studies, Pepperberg and her colleagues conducted simple but meaningful conversations with Alex rather than repeating meaningless words or phrases over and over. One person would ask—and the other answer—such questions as, “What shape is the wood?” “How many?” and “What object is blue?” The one asking the questions praised the other party for correct answers. The same study was repeated using the same model and content, but different categories. After these studies, when Alex used the words appropriately, he was given the object he asked for and told that he was “a good boy.” By this training method, as already mentioned, Alex learned the names of more than 100 objects, and to respond correctly to questions relating to their shapes, colors and structures.²⁰ By observing the two people talking, he could understand what those carrying out the test were saying to him and could respond to them in a meaningful way. Most of the time, he listened to two people asking each other questions in a systematic way. After a time, he started expressing wishes such as “Tickle me” or “I want popcorn.” When offered something other than the food he asked for, he would refuse it and repeat his request. He would ask to be taken to different places—for example, “Wanna go chair.” If taken to the wrong place, he would stay on the person’s arm and repeat what he wanted.

In another test, Alex was shown a tray of seven objects like a purple key, yellow wood, green leather, blue paper, an orange peg, gray box, and a red truck; and asked which one was gray, Alex would look carefully at all seven objects and answer, “Box.” A red paper triangle and a blue wooden triangle were put on the tray. When asked what was the same, he answered, “Shape.”²¹

Research and tests conducted on parrots and other talking birds are not just limited to Alex. Another rather surprising example is a small parrot named Blue Bird. Within a few weeks of the project’s start, this bird started talking in a meaningful way and learned to ask for things understandably. When he wanted someone to open the door of his cage or any other door, he could use phrases like, “Open the door,” “Can I have some?” when he wanted something someone was eating, or “Take a shower” when he wanted someone to turn the water on so he could bathe.²²

Blue Bird wasn't taught words directly or formally. Instead, his trainer, Sheryl C. Wilson, would say words slowly and in context, for example, "Open the door" on opening the door of his cage. The bird seemed to understand. Using this method, in a short time he began to use these words in their proper context: "How are you?" "Whatcha doing?" "Where you going?" "Hello," "Good morning," "Good night" and "Such a sleepy little birdie." He could also comprehend and obey Wilson's requests such as "Get down," "Please go into your cage," and "No!" Whenever his owner called, the bird would fly straight to her.²³

All this information shows how some birds can, in common with humans, use general and abstract concepts and remember information stored in their memory. As with parrots, which have the appropriate anatomical structures to imitate human sounds, certain other birds can also talk to us in a meaningful way. No doubt they urge us to think of them as indicators of the knowledge and wisdom in God's creation. It is God Who creates birds with diverse talents like speech and mimicry. By His will, these creatures exhibit behavioral skills that surpass expectations of their brain capacity to an astonishing degree. This, together with thousands of similar examples in nature, lets people see God's power, strengthening the faith of those who already believe and allowing many who do not know God as they should to consider the reality of creation.

God has commanded us to ponder the vast evidence in the skies and upon Earth. However, it should not be forgotten that only those who listen to the voice of their conscience will be able to see this manifest evidence and conceptualize its meaning with God's consent:

Have they not looked at the sky above them: How We structured it and made it beautiful and how there are no fissures in it? And the Earth: how We stretched it out and cast firmly embedded mountains onto it and caused luxuriant plants of every kind to grow in it, an instruction and a reminder for every penitent human being. (Qur'an, 50:6-8)

Communication and Signaling in Birds

Birds produce meaningful communications by their facial expressions, beak movements, feather ruffling, elongating their necks, crouching, bouncing, and flapping their wings. Although each species has its own body language, many different species interpret movements in the same way. For example, various species interpret an upward thrust of the beak as expressing the intention to fly, and the lowering of the breast as a warning of danger. Also, several species perceive raising the tail feathers as a threat, or displaying bright colors atop of the head as a declaration of the intent to attack. Via facial expression, birds can convey a variety of messages to those around them—

negative feelings such as dislike and resentment, as well as positive ones like pleasure, enthusiasm and curiosity.²⁴

Birds produce different facial expressions by movements of the beak, or by positioning the feathers above the beak, on the chin, or atop the head. In some species, the feathers above the eye can also move independently. Moreover, many species make a display by opening their beaks. For example, the tawny frogmouth opens its beak to reveal its large, bright green oral cavity, emphasizing the size of its beak and making it appear more intimidating. Some other species open their beaks as a form of threatening behavior, usually silently, but sometimes enhance the performance with hissing or loud breathing.²⁵

Besides communicating by means of body language, birds produce a great variety of sounds to communicate with other members of their flock, neighbors, or family members. These range from short, simple calls to songs that are surprisingly long and complex. Sometimes birds such as the green woodpecker use different instruments or, like the American woodpecker, use special feathers to produce sound.

Birds also communicate through smell, though since their sense of smell is poor, their communication is based mainly on sound and sight. At times of poor visibility, as at night or in dense foliage, sound is most advantageous, and is also the ideal method for long-distance communication. If conditions are right, birdsong can be heard for up to a few kilometers.

As we have seen in the example of Alex, the African Grey, birds also have conceptualization and communication skills. In certain circumstances, they demonstrate talents equivalent to those of children of primary-school age, learning series of words and other means of human communication through social interaction. When alone, these parrots play vocalization games and when in the company of people, they join vocalizations together to produce new assemblages from existing sequences of speech. God, the Creator of everything on Earth and in the skies, equips them with the talents and characteristics that set them apart. Accordingly, our praises for the supreme beauty of our environment is praise that belongs to God.

The Language of Calls and Songs

To call one another, birds produce sounds of extremely high frequency and strength. Only a few species such as pelicans, storks, and certain vultures have no call. The acoustic calls used by birds amongst themselves form a language of sorts. Their songs, which are longer and generally related to courtship, consist of a series of notes and usually contain melodies.

Birdsong is usually heard in spring, whereas the calls, much simpler than songs, are used by both sexes and heard throughout the year. Birdcalls allow swift communication

via simple messages without a great expenditure of energy.²⁶ These calls' main functions can be listed as follows:

- to establish a bird's species
- to indicate the bird's gender
- to show its location
- to demarcate and defend a territory
- to advertise a source of food
- to let young birds recognize their parents
- to keep the flock together
- to warn of the presence of an enemy
- to intimidate an enemy
- for courtship
- to mark the changeover of responsibility for nesting duties such as incubating or feeding
- to practice and perfect songs

Usually, birdsong is not composed of randomly produced sounds. Songs are exceptionally diverse melodies of specific meaning, sung for a purpose, and are much more complex than the calls used for signaling. They are generally used by males to advertise and defend a territory, or in courtship. It is also believed that songs serve a social function. When a pair is building their nest, they also establish communication by song. Experiments on caged birds have also demonstrated that birds find it easier to learn songs if another bird is present, but out of sight, in another cage.²⁷

Male and female songbirds have different brain structures, particularly in the regions related to sound production. With many songbird species, the males can sing, but the females cannot. The males use "song" to call their mates or designate a tree, pole, or electrical cable as a place to perch. Each species sings a song with its own characteristics, but any given species' songs display variations according to age, sex, particular time of year, and geographical location—appropriate for the environment in which they live. For example, birds that live in meadows use "songs of flight." Similarly, ones that live in the dense foliage of rain forests or reed thickets have loud voices to compensate for reduced visibility.

Knowing which song to sing in which environment, and the meaning and purpose of each song, are not something that each individual bird can work out for itself. Behavior indicative of such wisdom and foresight by creatures with no reason or judgment exhibits the inspiration of God in living creatures. He creates each creature with its necessary characteristics and inspires its rational behavior.

Chapter -3-

Birds that Imitate Sound Invalidate Evolutionary Theory

In its claims about birds' evolution, evolutionary theory, as in all other fields of science, is full of contradictions. Defenders of evolutionary theory base their claims more on a series of hypotheses and assumptions than on findings and research results. Several of our books have presented scientific evidence of the illogic and contradictions in evolutionary theory, and have presented the invalidity of their claims with their own admissions. (For detailed information, see *Darwinism Refuted*, *Evolution Deceit*, *The Collapse of Evolution Theory in 20 Questions*, by Harun Yahya). In this book, accordingly, we will deal only with the subject of how birds, with their various physical characteristics and talent for mimicry, present evidence to counter evolutionary theory.

Birds' Vocal Learning Chops Down the Evolutionary Tree

In order to explain the diversity of species, Darwin drew an imaginary evolutionary tree and offered the theory that all living creatures arose from one single ancestor and have diverged from one another into distinct species. But this imaginary evolutionary tree, which is claimed as the backbone of evolutionary theory, has been turned upside down by the results of findings in the field of paleontology and molecular studies.

Among the most important examples that invalidate evolutionary theory are the birds that can imitate sounds and human speech.

1. Songbirds, Parrots and Hummingbirds—Three Groups of Birds that can Imitate—Have Similar Physical and Mental Characteristics in Spite of Not Being Related

According to the evolutionists, songbirds, parrots and hummingbirds must come from a single ancestor, because of their similar physical and mental characteristics. However, these three categories of birds are not related in any way and so, are placed in different branches of the hypothetical evolutionary tree. First and foremost, no fossils of any common ancestor have been found, nor are any similar characteristics found in other varieties of birds closely related to these species. Accordingly, evolutionists are unable to answer the question of how these categories of bird all possess the ability of

being able to speak and imitate sounds, despite being so far apart from one another on the imaginary evolutionary tree.

Gradually, therefore, research has pushed the evolutionists into an impasse. For example, a test carried out on the Anna hummingbird (*Calypte anna*) in 1990 established that some of the males imitated the singing of other birds. This is firm evidence of the hummingbird's ability to learn songs. As a result of tests carried out on talking birds, scientists concluded that when the hummingbird is singing, its brain is activated in seven different places. This same observation also is true for songbirds and parrots.

This discovery creates serious problems regarding the evolutionary phases between living creatures. The songs of birds that can imitate sound are genetically coded, as opposed to sounds that they learn later in life. Of these, however, only adult songbirds, parrots and hummingbirds have the ability to learn songs and repeat them accurately. According to Erich Jarvis, a neurobiologist at Duke University Medical Center, this kind of vocal learning closely resembles the process by which humans learn to speak. Surprisingly, this research shows that birds skilled at vocal learning are in a completely different branch of the so-called evolutionary path. What's more, none of the species that evolutionists claim are closely related to these birds can learn any similar songs.

Regarding this subject, two evolutionary scenarios are put forward. The first states that all birds come from a common ancestor with the necessary brain structure for imitating sounds but that somehow, only certain species developed the ability. The other species were unsuccessful in this respect and lost these skills over time. However, this scenario is not given credit, not even by many evolutionists! According to celebrated neurobiologist Erich Jarvis, it seems extremely unlikely that this trait could be gained or lost more than once in *both* birds and mammals.²⁸ If this kind of undeveloped brain structure exists, asks Jarvis, then why is it not present in reptiles and dinosaurs as well?
29

Evolutionists put forward a second scenario: that in the brains of these three birds, these learning structures each evolved independently of one another. This claim is not only scientifically unfounded, but also cannot answer the most basic questions: How did this skill come about in birds? How is it passed on from generation to generation? And how was the necessary physiological structure for this skill formed? Of course, evolutionists cannot produce a tenable explanation for how this came about in even one of these species. Thus, it is unreasonable for them to claim that the three different bird species have evolved independently. This chain of events cannot be explained by evolution, and could not possibly be realized coincidentally in three different processes in three different living creatures. That is like saying that blind coincidences resulted in successful outcomes—on three different occasions.

Facts that science has proven also show how evolutionists lack solutions on this subject. Erich Jarvis expressed the situation in which he found himself, in the light of scientific findings:

... Birds challenge all of us to rethink outmoded concepts of evolution... Throughout our education, we have this concept of linear evolution instilled in us. We're told that ... vertebrates evolved from some worm-like creature to fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, and so forth, and that living vertebrates represent these stages in both body plan and brain intelligence. And once there were mammals, they evolved to primates, then humans, being last at the top of the hierarchy. But this concept of lower and higher in the vertebrate lineage is just completely false.³⁰

The evolutionary tree on which the evolutionists rely is a strained series of links between different animal species. This tree, based on anatomical similarities among animals, has no real scientific foundation and, as an inevitable result, is full of contradictions. One example is exemplified by those birds that imitate sounds. According to the family tree theory, three living species belonging to three very different branches share one highly complex characteristic—in vocal learning, the same seven areas of the brain are activated in all three. As has been shown, similarities among animals are no evidence of evolution. Attempts to claim otherwise are no more than biased interpretation in the name of science.

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN LIVING CREATURES DO NOT PROVE THAT THEY COME FROM COMMON ANCESTOR

Evolutionists frequently point to similarities between living creatures as evidence to support their claims. For example, the bones in a human arm, a whale's fin and a bat's wing have similar structure. This, according to evolutionists, proves that the animals in question evolved from one single ancestor. However, it is mistaken to think in this way. Actually, this similarity is evidence that all living creatures have been designed according to a plan. From what we have observed in nature, it is evident that a Creator has formed all life within the scope of a similar plan, and fashioned all living creatures in accordance with their needs. When we examine the scientific evidence, the "common design" explanation emerges as the correct one.

**To Prove that Animals Are Descended from a Single Ancestor,
Then You Should Produce a Mechanism, but There Is None**

If you claim that animals are descended from a common ancestor, it's not enough to use the similarities between animals as proof. It would be more apt to show a

mechanism, but no such mechanism has yet been put forward. For example, which mechanisms transformed the forelimb of a mouse or a shrew-like animal, imagined ancestors of bats, into a bat's wing? Similarly, we can ask what mechanism caused the hind limbs of a land animal to turn into the fins of a whale? For this to happen, according to evolutionary theory, natural selection and mutation are required. However, these two mechanisms make sense only if all intermediate phases in the evolutionary process are of some advantage to the species. If the incomplete forms of the said organs afford the animal no benefit, they are a disadvantage and constitute a handicap for the animal in question. Therefore, there is no natural mechanism for developing the complex organs of animals or for producing genetic information that corresponds to them.

If Several Animals Share Similar Characteristics, They Cannot Be Claimed to Have a Common Ancestor

The organs of many creatures resemble those of other animals, but the evolutionists cannot claim all are derived from one common ancestor. For example, the eyes of an octopus are very much like yours, but according to the evolutionists, these similar structures are not derived from a common root (that is to say homologous). Flies and birds both have wings, but again, these cannot be described as homologous. The evolutionists cannot claim an evolutionary relationship between these animals, despite their great similarities, because in the so-called evolutionary trees drawn up on the basis of fossil records and morphology, these animals are far apart from one another. For this reason, evolutionists describe these structures not as homologous but as “analogous”—that is, similar in spite of not having a common root. However, if some similar structures can be analogous, why not all? So far, evolutionists have not provided a tenable answer to this question.

They try to get around this by producing not an answer, but an imaginary concept they call “parallel evolution.” Parallel evolution is attributed to animals and organs that seem to have acquired similar characteristics over time, but which have no evolutionary relationship to one another. For example, let's take the octopus once more. In spite of being an invertebrate—and therefore, according to the evolutionists, a primitive creature—is as intelligent as a dog, a highly developed mammal. In this case, evolutionists claim that an “intelligence” factor has developed separately in each species, an imaginary phenomenon they describe as “parallel evolution.” But since the octopus is a primitive creature in terms of evolution, it should be a creature of very low intelligence.

Another example is the ability to fly. Insects, birds, extinct reptiles, and even certain living mammals have wings; which is to say, flight has evolved in at least four different classifications of animals. According to evolution theory, why should all of these groups,

on completely different imaginary evolutionary paths, have the same outcome? Is it possible for these completely separate groups to develop the same organic structure through an accidental evolutionary process? Why would coincidences follow the same common design in each case? This illustrates the folly of explaining away all these questions by mere coincidence: The common design in these creatures can be explained only by the existence of a common Designer, that is to say, through God's creation.

Molecular Evidence Disproves the Claim that a Common Ancestor Can Explain Similarities

Regarding similar structures, the most important evidence to disprove the claims of evolutionary theory comes from molecular biology.

Before the genetic coding structure of DNA was discovered, the claim that similar organs "evolved" from a common ancestor was presented as plausible by evolutionists. As more knowledge was gained of genetics, however, scientists discovered the genetic code for similar organs, and it emerged that usually these genes were markedly different. This discovery dealt the common-ancestor assertion a deadly blow.

One fact that emerged in regard to this discovery was the five-fingered (or pentadactyl) hand structure encountered in all land-living vertebrates.

The hands and feet of a frog, lizard, squirrel and a monkey all have five digits. Even the bone structure of birds and bats conforms to this basic design. Evolutionists used the pentadactyl structure as evidence for the claim that all these various species derived from a common ancestor.

Today, however, even the evolutionists have accepted that pentadactyl anatomy occurs in species of different groups, between which no evolutionary link can be established. In two separate articles published in 1991 and 1996, evolutionary biologist M. Coates points out that the pentadactyl phenomenon appears independently in both the antracosaur and the amphibians.³¹ This finding indicates that the pentadactyl phenomenon does not constitute proof of a common ancestor.

But the essential blow to this evolutionary claim comes from molecular biology. The "pentadactyl homology" hypothesis, long defended in evolutionary publications, collapsed with the discovery that different genes controlled the digit structure in different creatures displaying the pentadactyl structure! As evolutionary biologist William Fix explains;

The older textbooks on evolution make much of the idea of homology, pointing out the obvious resemblances between the skeletons of the limbs of different animals. Thus the "pentadactyl" limb pattern is found in the arm of a man, the wing of a bird, and flipper of a whale—and this is held to indicate their common origin. Now if these various structures were transmitted by the same gene couples, varied from time to time by

mutations and acted upon by environmental selection, the theory would make good sense. Unfortunately this is not the case. Homologous organs are now known to be produced by totally different gene complexes in the different species. The concept of homology in terms of similar genes handed on from a common ancestor has broken down... ³²

2. Birds that Display Vocal Learning Show Similarity with Humans in Terms of the Genes Determining Brain Structures

Evolutionists claim that genetic similarities derive from evolutionary development. However, when “biochemical similarities” are considered as a whole, they are seen to refute the alleged family tree that constitutes the backbone of claims supporting the theory of evolution. (For detailed information, see *The Secrets of DNA*, by Harun Yahya.)

That molecular verification does not support evolutionary theory is expressed in an article by Elizabeth Pennisi, “Is It Time to Uproot the Tree of Life?” published in *Science* magazine in 1999. Pennisi states that the genetic analyses and comparisons made by the Darwinist biologists to illustrate the “evolutionary tree” give quite the opposite result, and that “the new data casts a shadow over the evolutionary picture”:

A year ago, biologists looking over newly sequenced genomes from more than a dozen microorganisms thought these data might support the accepted plot lines of life's early history. But what they saw confounded them. Comparisons of the genomes then available not only didn't clarify the picture of how life's major groupings evolved, they confused it. And now, with an additional eight microbial sequences in hand, the situation has gotten even more confusing... Many evolutionary biologists had thought they could roughly see the beginnings of life's three kingdoms... When full DNA sequences opened the way to comparing other kinds of genes, researchers expected that they would simply add detail to this tree. But “nothing could be further from the truth,” says Claire Fraser, head of The Institute for Genomic Research (TIGR) in Rockville, Maryland.

Instead, the comparisons have yielded many versions of the tree of life... ³³

In summary, on examination of living species at a molecular level, the homology hypotheses of evolutionary theory collapse, one by one. Jonathan Wells, an American molecular biologist, summarizes the situation in his book published in 2000:

Inconsistencies among trees based on different molecules, and the bizarre trees that result from some molecular analyses, have now plunged phylogeny into a crisis. ³⁴

In recent years, research conducted on the genetic structure of birds has also turned upside-down the evolutionists' theory of genetic similarity. To understand vocal learning in birds, Erich Jarvis and his team of colleagues examined the brains of 12 of the 30 or more species of hummingbird found in Brazil, in the movement of a gene that is activated when the birds sing. Their research established that a gene called “zenk” is active in seven different centers of the brain. It emerged that this characteristic is present not just in hummingbirds, but also in parrots and songbirds. ³⁵

In light of this information, scientists began making further comparisons between the brains of humans and birds. But the evolutionists—who wanted to present genetic similarities between humans and chimpanzees as evidence of evolution—felt uncomfortable about conducting studies using methods that produced evidence contrary to their position. The comparisons made on this subject to date are biased opinions supporting the fable that humans and monkeys have a common ancestor. When a genetic similarity was established between birds and humans, the evidence produced to date by the evolutionists was invalidated once again. Erich Jarvis, himself an evolutionist, expressed how this dogmatic approach, resulting from an evolutionist standpoint and which posed an obstacle to real observation, gave him great difficulty in his research:

The difference... between humans and songbirds, besides the general brain organization of mammals and birds, is that humans have more of what the birds have... But in order to explain this hypothesis of parallels between vocal imitation structures in the bird brain and language structures in human brains, I first have to get around this hundred-year-old dogma that their brains are so very different.³⁶

The reason behind the evolutionists' discomfort was that the possibility of a common gene in hummingbirds and humans could contradict the concept of homology and thus constitute evidence against evolution. Accordingly, they were not keen to see information on this subject emerge. Nevertheless, Jarvis explains that research in this field could be illuminating:

Such genetic experiments, even with an animal as seemingly distant from humans as the hummingbird, could help us understand human language... We're finding with these DNA chips that somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of the genes that we get from the songbird brain have a homologous counterpart in humans and mammals in general."³⁷

The Darwinists have done no more with evolutionary theory than present information they believe suits their purposes, using the support of certain organs of the media as evidence of evolution. On the subject of genetic similarities, as in every field, they manipulate deliberately, giving misleading information and suppressing information they see as contrary to their purposes. But upon impartial evaluation of research conducted at a molecular level, the truth is evident: No "organism" is the ancestor of any other, nor is any more "primitive" or "developed" than the other. God has created all living creatures individually and perfectly, together with perfect systems that differentiate them from one another.

God makes this known fact in the Qur'an:

He is God—the Creator, the Maker, the Giver of Form. To Him belong the Most Beautiful Names. Everything in the heavens and Earth glorifies Him. He is the Almighty, the All-Wise. (Qur'an, 59:24)

3. Birds with Vocal Learning Display a Talent Superior to Monkeys

Many evolutionists are known to be working toward establishing links between chimpanzees and humans, to present as evidence of a relationship between the two species. However, research conducted on chimpanzees' linguistic and thinking skills shows that they use a very simple form of sign language. Thus, evolutionists' attempts to show that monkeys are the animals most well-adapted for learning to speak have had disappointing results. This shows, once again, how no such relationship exists between humans and chimpanzees like the one that evolutionists imagine.

Attempts to get chimpanzees to talk proved inconclusive, in spite of the time and effort invested, showing how wrong the approach of the evolutionists was. Nevertheless, the press presented these studies in a distorted way. One of the most recent examples of this was a piece entitled "Can Chimpanzees Talk?" in the science and technology supplement of *Cumhuriyet* newspaper, 25 January, 2003. Based on a news item published on BBC's online site, this article claimed that a chimpanzee called Kanzi had been taught to speak. However, the vocalizations that the chimpanzee supposedly uttered had nothing to do with the skill of "speaking."

Jared Taglialatela and Sue Savage-Rumbaugh, two evolutionist researchers, claimed that Kanzi produced different vocalizations in response to certain behavior and objects, and that although the chimp used these vocalizations—meaning "banana," "grapes," "fruit juice" and "yes"—in different contexts, he did not substitute the word "yes" under any circumstances. These same researchers claimed that the chimpanzee had learned to do this by himself.

The fact is that chimpanzees cannot speak. A human's ability to speak is not based on making sounds; it comprises exceptional characteristics such as naming concepts and forming grammatically correct sentences, which no animal can master and whose source no linguist can explain. Evidently, the "words" that Kanzi used repeatedly cannot be taken as speech. However, in the same news item, the critics said that if the vocalizations were to be termed as language, syntax was also a consideration.

This point brings up a contradiction on the subject of evolutionary theory, since in fact, parrots are at least as skilled as Kanzi in terms of vocalization and mimicry. Furthermore, the vocalizations that chimpanzees produce are extremely basic when compared with the skills of parrots. However, no newspaper has made any mention of an evolutionary relationship between humans and parrots.

Objective opinions of scientists working on the subject for many years expose the claims seen in Kanzi's example as pure fantasy. Philip Lieberman, the famous linguist, emphasizes that attempts to teach language to chimps are doomed to failure:

Although animal trainers and investigators since the seventeenth century have tried to teach chimpanzees to talk, no chimpanzee has ever managed it. A chimpanzee's sound-producing anatomy is simply too different from that of humans. Chimpanzees might be able to produce a muffled approximation of human speech—if their brains could

plan and execute the necessary articulate maneuvers. But to do this, they would have to have our brains, which they obviously do not.³⁸

As noted, some birds' ability to imitate sounds renders the "evolutionary tree," one of the evolutionists' most important claims, meaningless from another angle. The fact is, a parrot bears no physical resemblance to a human; yet if it has an ability such as speech requiring a high level of intelligence. This does not conform to any evolutionary model. According to the evolutionists, chimpanzees are just a step or two below humans on the said evolutionary tree. But the high level of consciousness and ability to mimic sounds that talking birds demonstrate, disprove the evolutionists' claims.

Defenders of evolution are well aware that from the perspective of their theories, talking birds present a great difficulty. Another troublesome aspect for the evolutionists is related to the root of intelligence in birds. If birds, as evolution suggests, are less developed than the primates, then how have they, in spite of their tiny brains, suddenly managed to acquire this talent that primates—above them in the imaginary evolutionary tree—do not yet have? The Mynah bird, a member of the crow family, can also imitate human speech, but primates cannot. When evolutionists try to provide an explanation for this, they attribute the primate's inability to speak to its different laryngeal structures. However, this explanation is by no means adequate. Birds' laryngeal structures certainly do not resemble ours, but thanks to the ability God has given them, they can imitate human speech with ease. W. H. Thorpe, a Cambridge University zoologist and known authority on the subject, invalidates this claim of the evolutionists:

"How is it that an animal with this can talk?" he would say: "It is utterly impossible"
39

As we noted, certain birds' God-given talent is one of the important refutations of evolutionists' explanations. However different these birds' laryngeal structures may be, God has created them with an ability to speak in a way that fills us with admiration. It should not be forgotten that our Lord is the incomparable Creator; and it is by His will that **"He has given speech to everything."** (Qur'an, 41:21)

4. Birds that Possess Vocal Learning Display More Advanced Intelligence than Monkeys

As already pointed out, evolutionists have come up with the scenario that monkeys and humans share a common ancestor. But this preconception, unscientific and full of contradictions, further invalidates the so-called evolutionary tree. Because evolutionists begin with the hypothesis that the chimpanzee is man's closest relative, they also try to establish similarities between the behavior of monkeys and humans. Doing so, they try to give the impression that the chimpanzee is the closest to man in terms of intelligence. However, several creatures disprove the assertion that the chimpanzee is the next most intelligent being, after man.

The aforementioned Professor Irene Pepperberg, trainer of Alex as well as other an African Grey parrot by the name of "Griffin," proves this. It was long believed that playing with objects and speaking were behaviors found only in humans. But Pepperberg's observations disprove this:

Human children start combining their labels at about 22 months... So, they start not just identifying "cookie" and "milk," but will say "want milk" or "want more cookie."

And they also tend to develop this combinatorial behaviour at the same time as they start doing physical combinations of their toys. So, they will start stacking cups in serried sizes, and things like that. ⁴⁰

Parrots' ability to make connections between events and sounds was the subject of Pepperberg's speech at a meeting at the American Association for the Advancement of Science:

The simultaneous emergence of both vocal and physical combinatorial behaviours was always thought to be a purely primate trait, derived from primate brain area. The fact that we are finding this in animals so far removed from primates is exciting. ⁴¹

Again, a characteristic that evolutionists assert is unique to primates also found in parrots—which appear in an entirely different branch of the imaginary evolutionary tree—constitutes a major evolutionary impasse. That parrots and certain other birds have such a complex brain capacity invalidates the evolutionists' entire scenario. Therefore, their assertion that a small brain capacity develops into a large one is not applicable, which also invalidates the claim that primates are the ancestors of humans.

Furthermore, nature provides many more examples of "lesser" species exhibiting intelligent behavior. Beavers, for example, build a dam of ideal hydrodynamic size to stem the current; termites can build huge nests with special ventilation channels; and honeybees can build combs based on apparent knowledge of geometry and mathematics. Although they do perform such complex behaviors, all these creatures—especially the insects—have very small brains.

A final example of this miraculous behavior is provided by a crow named Betty, which was studied in the laboratory of Oxford University. Without any guidance, Betty bent a piece of wire she found in the laboratory into a shape that she could use as a tool. When she could not reach food at the bottom of a container with her beak, the crow bent the end of a piece of wire into a hook. With the use of the wire, she was then able to get her food out of the container easily. What amazed the scientists was that Betty understood that something she had seen before only in the mesh of a cage would be useful, thanks to its size and flexibility. She also succeeded in bending the flexible wire in a way that suited her purpose. Wanting to establish whether or not Betty's success was a coincidence, scientists noted that she succeeded nine out of ten times.

Scientists pointed out that despite her small brain, Betty had demonstrated a higher level of intelligence than chimpanzees. The BBC, with its Darwinist prejudices,

commented, "Betty is putting our closest cousins to shame."⁴² In other words, Betty had turned upside down the evolutionists' accepted ideas on the root of intelligence. Alex Kacelnik, a scientist from Oxford who conducted research on Betty, made this comment:

We assume primates will be cleverer because they are closest to us... But this animal (Betty) seems to be on a par at least with any primates we have seen.⁴³

Betty is just one of many birds exhibiting "intelligent" behavior. Many other scientific investigations are being conducted on this subject, making it ever more evident that all interpretations of the intelligence of chimpanzees, and consequent claims of the relationship between man and chimpanzee, are wrong.

Whatever the source of animal behavior, evolutionary claims do not support these characteristics. Many birds' behavioral patterns are determined from birth by their genetic structures. But if so, we should question who coded such behavioral patterns into the genes of birds? The evolutionists' response—that behavior is caused by instinct—leaves this question still unanswered, because birds' behavioral patterns are the inspiration of God and cannot be explained by such vague concepts as "instinct." The learned behavior seen in a few species of bird creates yet another dilemma for evolutionists, since they cannot say it is due to instinct. The surprising degree of consciousness observed in birds that have vocal learning such as parrots is a manifestation of the inspiration of God.

THE EVOLUTIONISTS, WHO TRY TO ESTABLISH A LINK BETWEEN LIVING BEINGS ACCORDING TO CRANIAL MEASUREMENTS, HAVE ONCE AGAIN SEEN THE ERROR OF THEIR WAYS:

One group of evolutionists claims that skull dimensions can demonstrate that humans and monkeys derive from a common ancestor. They relate humans' brains being larger than chimpanzees' to greater intelligence, and claim that over time, cranial dimensions have shown an evolutionary trend. This claim—that as the brain enlarged, its capacity to process information and store it in memory increased as well—is invalid, for a variety of reasons. Just the observations conducted on birds with vocal learning disprove it: Compared with a human's, a bird's brain is extremely small. For example, in birds weighing an average of 85 grams, the brain varies from 0.73 to 2.7 grams in weight. A bird's brain differs from a mammal's in that the complex folds found in mammals' cerebral cortex are missing, and the cerebral cortex itself is much smaller proportionally. Nevertheless, some birds are able to perform extremely complex operations such as speaking, learning songs, conceptualization and visual memorizing. Accordingly, there is no question of brain development from simple to complex to support evolutionary theory in living creatures.

* <http://www.earthlife.net/birds/nerves.html>

A 65-MILLION-YEAR-OLD FOSSIL OF A PARROT'S JAW IS IDENTICAL TO THE JAW OF THE CONTEMPORARY PARROT!

One important development to disappoint the evolutionists is the "fossil parrot jaw" found 40 years ago. This fossil, estimated as being 65 million years old, has the same structure as the jaw of a present-day parrot. When this fossil was first unearthed, it was not given the interest it deserved, but has become a current issue, due to investigations conducted by Thomas Stidham on the fossil collection of Berkeley University's Paleontology Museum. His research showed this to be the oldest parrot fossil found to date, and that this parrot lived in the same era as the dinosaurs. According to X-rays taken of the 13 mm fossil, the K-shaped mark on the fossil—the tracks of blood vessel and nerves—is identical to ones on a present-day parrot's beak.

* Thomas A. Stidham, "A lower jaw from a Cretaceous parrot," *Nature*, No: 396, 5 November 1998, pages 29-30.

Conclusion

I n this book, we've dealt with birds that can imitate sounds, only one group of God's wonderful creatures. We have examined the perfection of the mechanisms that enable them to imitate sounds they have heard, and even form simple sentences. Most humans, with their far superior intelligence, have difficulty in imitating other voices or speech while these little birds are able to imitate many sounds they have heard with perfection, showing how exceptionally skilled they are. Scientific research has concluded that this perfect mechanism in birds is a masterpiece of design. God's supreme knowledge and art, as shown in the magnificence of His creation, is too evident to be obscured by deceitful theories. Swans, peacocks, brightly colored parrots, budgerigars and an infinite variety of living creatures invalidate any claims of coincidence and demonstrate the infinite power of the Lord, our Creator.

As mentioned throughout this book, Darwinists insist on trying to attribute this perfect system to coincidences. According to their mentality, all the living creatures we see around us, all the skills they possess, and all their aesthetics and beauty are products of blind chance. The truth is, it's not possible to explain away the consciousness and design seen in all living creatures, at all times, with coincidences. It is purely because of ideology that Darwinists cannot see this evident reality—or rather, they do see it but won't accept it. These people cling to evolutionary theory out of their belief that it explains the mechanism of life. Accepting that it cannot forces them to accept the only possible and true alternative explanation, which is the truth of creation. This results in the complete collapse of Darwinism and any related materialist ideologies.

The thousands of examples that we see around us, but which the Darwinists pretend not to, are important pieces of evidence that destroy the distorted philosophies of those who deny the miracles of God's creation. Every person with a conscience will see in the wonderful structures of living creatures, and in the exceptional balance of the universe, the power of our Supreme and Omnipresent Lord. Darwinism and, consequently, the materialist philosophy that has deceived the world for nearly two centuries, will collapse. People will perceive the existence of God and start to live according to the beautiful ethics bidden by our Lord. The invalid system of thought that forms the basis of Darwinism will be completely destroyed, as God makes known in a verse of the Qur'an:

Rather We hurl the truth against falsehood and it cuts right through it and it vanishes clean away! (Qur'an, 21:18)

The Deception of Evolution

Darwinism, in other words the theory of evolution, was put forward with the aim of denying the fact of creation, but is in truth nothing but failed, unscientific nonsense. This theory, which claims that life emerged by chance from inanimate matter, was invalidated by the scientific evidence of clear “design” in the universe and in living things. In this way, science confirmed the fact that God created the universe and the living things in it. The propaganda carried out today in order to keep the theory of evolution alive is based solely on the distortion of the scientific facts, biased interpretation, and lies and falsehoods disguised as science.

Yet this propaganda cannot conceal the truth. The fact that the theory of evolution is the greatest deception in the history of science has been expressed more and more in the scientific world over the last 20-30 years. Research carried out after the 1980s in particular has revealed that the claims of Darwinism are totally unfounded, something that has been stated by a large number of scientists. In the United States in particular, many scientists from such different fields as biology, biochemistry and paleontology recognize the invalidity of Darwinism and employ the concept of intelligent design to account for the origin of life. This “intelligent design” is a scientific expression of the fact that God created all living things.

We have examined the collapse of the theory of evolution and the proofs of creation in great scientific detail in many of our works, and are still continuing to do so. Given the enormous importance of this subject, it will be of great benefit to summarize it here.

The Scientific Collapse Of Darwinism

Although this doctrine goes back as far as ancient Greece, the theory of evolution was advanced extensively in the nineteenth century. The most important development that made it the top topic of the world of science was Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, published in 1859. In this book, he denied that God created different living species on Earth separately, for he claimed that all living beings had a common ancestor and had diversified over time through small changes. Darwin's theory was not based on any concrete scientific finding; as he also accepted, it was just an “assumption.” Moreover, as Darwin confessed in the long chapter of his book titled “Difficulties of the Theory,” the theory failed in the face of many critical questions.

Darwin invested all of his hopes in new scientific discoveries, which he expected to solve these difficulties. However, contrary to his expectations, scientific findings

expanded the dimensions of these difficulties. The defeat of Darwinism in the face of science can be reviewed under three basic topics:

- 1) The theory cannot explain how life originated on Earth.
 - 2) No scientific finding shows that the “evolutionary mechanisms” proposed by the theory have any evolutionary power at all.
 - 3) The fossil record proves the exact opposite of what the theory suggests.
- In this section, we will examine these three basic points in general outlines:

The First Insumountable Step: The Origin Of Life

The theory of evolution posits that all living species evolved from a single living cell that emerged on the primitive Earth 3.8 billion years ago. How a single cell could generate millions of complex living species and, if such an evolution really occurred, why traces of it cannot be observed in the fossil record are some of the questions that the theory cannot answer. However, first and foremost, we need to ask: How did this “first cell” originate?

Since the theory of evolution denies creation and any kind of supernatural intervention, it maintains that the “first cell” originated coincidentally within the laws of nature, without any design, plan or arrangement. According to the theory, inanimate matter must have produced a living cell as a result of coincidences. Such a claim, however, is inconsistent with the most unassailable rules of biology.

“Life Comes From Life”

In his book, Darwin never referred to the origin of life. The primitive understanding of science in his time rested on the assumption that living beings had a very simple structure. Since medieval times, spontaneous generation, which asserts that non-living materials came together to form living organisms, had been widely accepted. It was commonly believed that insects came into being from food leftovers, and mice from wheat. Interesting experiments were conducted to prove this theory. Some wheat was placed on a dirty piece of cloth, and it was believed that mice would originate from it after a while.

Similarly, maggots developing in rotting meat was assumed to be evidence of spontaneous generation. However, it was later understood that worms did not appear on meat spontaneously, but were carried there by flies in the form of larvae, invisible to the naked eye.

Even when Darwin wrote *The Origin of Species*, the belief that bacteria could come into existence from non-living matter was widely accepted in the world of science.

However, five years after the publication of Darwin's book, Louis Pasteur announced his results after long studies and experiments, that disproved spontaneous generation, a cornerstone of Darwin's theory. In his triumphal lecture at the Sorbonne in 1864, Pasteur said: “Never will the doctrine of spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow struck by this simple experiment.”⁴⁴

For a long time, advocates of the theory of evolution resisted these findings. However, as the development of science unraveled the complex structure of the cell of a living being, the idea that life could come into being coincidentally faced an even greater impasse.

Inconclusive Efforts In The Twentieth Century

The first evolutionist who took up the subject of the origin of life in the twentieth century was the renowned Russian biologist Alexander Oparin. With various theses he advanced in the 1930s, he tried to prove that a living cell could originate by coincidence. These studies, however, were doomed to failure, and Oparin had to make the following confession:

Unfortunately, however, the problem of the origin of the cell is perhaps the most obscure point in the whole study of the evolution of organisms.⁴⁵

Evolutionist followers of Oparin tried to carry out experiments to solve this problem. The best known experiment was carried out by the American chemist Stanley Miller in 1953. Combining the gases he alleged to have existed in the primordial Earth's atmosphere in an experiment set-up, and adding energy to the mixture, Miller synthesized several organic molecules (amino acids) present in the structure of proteins.

Barely a few years had passed before it was revealed that this experiment, which was then presented as an important step in the name of evolution, was invalid, for the atmosphere used in the experiment was very different from the real Earth conditions.⁴⁶

After a long silence, Miller confessed that the atmosphere medium he used was unrealistic.⁴⁷

All the evolutionists' efforts throughout the twentieth century to explain the origin of life ended in failure. The geochemist Jeffrey Bada, from the San Diego Scripps Institute accepts this fact in an article published in *Earth* magazine in 1998:

Today as we leave the twentieth century, we still face the biggest unsolved problem that we had when we entered the twentieth century: How did life originate on Earth.⁴⁸

The Complex Structure Of Life

The primary reason why the theory of evolution ended up in such a great impasse regarding the origin of life is that even those living organisms deemed to be the simplest have incredibly complex structures. The cell of a living thing is more complex than all of our man-made technological products. Today, even in the most developed laboratories of the world, a living cell cannot be produced by bringing organic chemicals together.

The conditions required for the formation of a cell are too great in quantity to be explained away by coincidences. The probability of proteins, the building blocks of a cell, being synthesized coincidentally, is 1 in 10^{950} for an average protein made up of 500 amino acids. In mathematics, a probability smaller than 1 over 10^{50} is considered to be impossible in practical terms.

The DNA molecule, which is located in the nucleus of a cell and which stores genetic information, is an incredible databank. If the information coded in DNA were written down, it would make a giant library consisting of an estimated 900 volumes of encyclopedias consisting of 500 pages each.

A very interesting dilemma emerges at this point: DNA can replicate itself only with the help of some specialized proteins (enzymes). However, the synthesis of these

enzymes can be realized only by the information coded in DNA. As they both depend on each other, they have to exist at the same time for replication. This brings the scenario that life originated by itself to a deadlock. Prof. Leslie Orgel, an evolutionist of repute from the University of San Diego, California, confesses this fact in the September 1994 issue of the *Scientific American* magazine:

It is extremely improbable that proteins and nucleic acids, both of which are structurally complex, arose spontaneously in the same place at the same time. Yet it also seems impossible to have one without the other. And so, at first glance, one might have to conclude that life could never, in fact, have originated by chemical means.⁴⁹

No doubt, if it is impossible for life to have originated from natural causes, then it has to be accepted that life was “created” in a supernatural way. This fact explicitly invalidates the theory of evolution, whose main purpose is to deny creation.

Imaginary Mechanism Of Evolution

The second important point that negates Darwin's theory is that both concepts put forward by the theory as “evolutionary mechanisms” were understood to have, in reality, no evolutionary power.

Darwin based his evolution allegation entirely on the mechanism of “natural selection.” The importance he placed on this mechanism was evident in the name of his book: *The Origin of Species, By Means of Natural Selection...*

Natural selection holds that those living things that are stronger and more suited to the natural conditions of their habitats will survive in the struggle for life. For example, in a deer herd under the threat of attack by wild animals, those that can run faster will survive. Therefore, the deer herd will be comprised of faster and stronger individuals. However, unquestionably, this mechanism will not cause deer to evolve and transform themselves into another living species, for instance, horses.

Therefore, the mechanism of natural selection has no evolutionary power. Darwin was also aware of this fact and had to state this in his book *The Origin of Species*:

Natural selection can do nothing until favorable individual differences or variations occur.⁵⁰

Lamarck's Impact

So, how could these “favorable variations” occur? Darwin tried to answer this question from the standpoint of the primitive understanding of science at that time. According to the French biologist Chevalier de Lamarck (1744-1829), who lived before Darwin, living creatures passed on the traits they acquired during their lifetime to the next generation. He asserted that these traits, which accumulated from one generation to another, caused new species to be formed. For instance, he claimed that giraffes evolved from antelopes; as they struggled to eat the leaves of high trees, their necks were extended from generation to generation.

Darwin also gave similar examples. In his book *The Origin of Species*, for instance, he said that some bears going into water to find food transformed themselves into whales over time.⁵¹

However, the laws of inheritance discovered by Gregor Mendel (1822-84) and verified by the science of genetics, which flourished in the twentieth century, utterly demolished the legend that acquired traits were passed on to subsequent generations. Thus, natural selection fell out of favor as an evolutionary mechanism.

Neo-Darwinism And Mutations

In order to find a solution, Darwinists advanced the “Modern Synthetic Theory,” or as it is more commonly known, Neo-Darwinism, at the end of the 1930's. Neo-Darwinism added mutations, which are distortions formed in the genes of living beings due to such

external factors as radiation or replication errors, as the “cause of favorable variations” in addition to natural mutation.

Today, the model that stands for evolution in the world is Neo-Darwinism. The theory maintains that millions of living beings formed as a result of a process whereby numerous complex organs of these organisms (e.g., ears, eyes, lungs, and wings) underwent “mutations,” that is, genetic disorders. Yet, there is an outright scientific fact that totally undermines this theory: Mutations do not cause living beings to develop; on the contrary, they are always harmful.

The reason for this is very simple: DNA has a very complex structure, and random effects can only harm it. The American geneticist B.G. Ranganathan explains this as follows:

First, genuine mutations are very rare in nature. Secondly, most mutations are harmful since they are random, rather than orderly changes in the structure of genes; any random change in a highly ordered system will be for the worse, not for the better. For example, if an earthquake were to shake a highly ordered structure such as a building, there would be a random change in the framework of the building which, in all probability, would not be an improvement.⁵²

Not surprisingly, no mutation example, which is useful, that is, which is observed to develop the genetic code, has been observed so far. All mutations have proved to be harmful. It was understood that mutation, which is presented as an “evolutionary mechanism,” is actually a genetic occurrence that harms living things, and leaves them disabled. (The most common effect of mutation on human beings is cancer.) Of course, a destructive mechanism cannot be an “evolutionary mechanism.” Natural selection, on the other hand, “can do nothing by itself,” as Darwin also accepted. This fact shows us that there is no “evolutionary mechanism” in nature. Since no evolutionary mechanism exists, no such any imaginary process called “evolution” could have taken place.

The Fossil Record: No Sign Of Intermediate Forms

The clearest evidence that the scenario suggested by the theory of evolution did not take place is the fossil record.

According to this theory, every living species has sprung from a predecessor. A previously existing species turned into something else over time and all species have come into being in this way. In other words, this transformation proceeds gradually over millions of years.

Had this been the case, numerous intermediary species should have existed and lived within this long transformation period.

For instance, some half-fish/half-reptiles should have lived in the past which had acquired some reptilian traits in addition to the fish traits they already had. Or there should have existed some reptile-birds, which acquired some bird traits in addition to the reptilian traits they already had. Since these would be in a transitional phase, they

should be disabled, defective, crippled living beings. Evolutionists refer to these imaginary creatures, which they believe to have lived in the past, as “transitional forms.”

If such animals ever really existed, there should be millions and even billions of them in number and variety. More importantly, the remains of these strange creatures should be present in the fossil record. In *The Origin of Species*, Darwin explained:

If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking most closely all of the species of the same group together must assuredly have existed... Consequently, evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains.⁵³

Darwin's Hopes Shattered

However, although evolutionists have been making strenuous efforts to find fossils since the middle of the nineteenth century all over the world, no transitional forms have yet been uncovered. All of the fossils, contrary to the evolutionists' expectations, show that life appeared on Earth all of a sudden and fully-formed.

One famous British paleontologist, Derek V. Ager, admits this fact, even though he is an evolutionist:

The point emerges that if we examine the fossil record in detail, whether at the level of orders or of species, we find—over and over again—not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another.⁵⁴

This means that in the fossil record, all living species suddenly emerge as fully formed, without any intermediate forms in between. This is just the opposite of Darwin's assumptions. Also, this is very strong evidence that all living things are created. The only explanation of a living species emerging suddenly and complete in every detail without any evolutionary ancestor is that it was created. This fact is admitted also by the widely known evolutionist biologist Douglas Futuyma:

Creation and evolution, between them, exhaust the possible explanations for the origin of living things. Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence.⁵⁵

Fossils show that living beings emerged fully developed and in a perfect state on the Earth. That means that “the origin of species,” contrary to Darwin's supposition, is not evolution, but creation.

The Tale Of Human Evolution

The subject most often brought up by advocates of the theory of evolution is the subject of the origin of man. The Darwinist claim holds that modern man evolved from ape-like creatures. During this alleged evolutionary process, which is supposed to have started 4-5 million years ago, some “transitional forms” between modern man and his

ancestors are supposed to have existed. According to this completely imaginary scenario, four basic “categories” are listed:

1. *Australopithecus*
2. *Homo habilis*
3. *Homo erectus*
4. *Homo sapiens*

Evolutionists call man's so-called first ape-like ancestors *Australopithecus*, which means “*South African ape*.” These living beings are actually nothing but an old ape species that has become extinct. Extensive research done on various *Australopithecus* specimens by two world famous anatomists from England and the USA, namely, Lord Solly Zuckerman and Prof. Charles Oxnard, shows that these apes belonged to an ordinary ape species that became extinct and bore no resemblance to humans.⁵⁶

Evolutionists classify the next stage of human evolution as “*homo*,” that is “man.” According to their claim, the living beings in the *Homo* series are more developed than *Australopithecus*. Evolutionists devise a fanciful evolution scheme by arranging different fossils of these creatures in a particular order. This scheme is imaginary because it has never been proved that there is an evolutionary relation between these different classes. Ernst Mayr, one of the twentieth century's most important evolutionists, contends in his book *One Long Argument* that “particularly historical [puzzles] such as the origin of life or of *Homo sapiens*, are extremely difficult and may even resist a final, satisfying explanation.”⁵⁷

By outlining the link chain as *Australopithecus* > *Homo habilis* > *Homo erectus* > *Homo sapiens*, evolutionists imply that each of these species is one another's ancestor. However, recent findings of paleoanthropologists have revealed that *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, and *Homo erectus* lived at different parts of the world at the same time.⁵⁸

Moreover, a certain segment of humans classified as *Homo erectus* have lived up until very modern times. *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis* and *Homo sapiens sapiens* (modern man) co-existed in the same region.⁵⁹

This situation apparently indicates the invalidity of the claim that they are ancestors of one another. A paleontologist from Harvard University, Stephen Jay Gould, explains this deadlock of the theory of evolution, although he is an evolutionist himself:

What has become of our ladder if there are three coexisting lineages of hominids (*A. africanus*, the robust australopithecines, and *H. habilis*), none clearly derived from another? Moreover, none of the three display any evolutionary trends during their tenure on earth.⁶⁰

Put briefly, the scenario of human evolution, which is “upheld” with the help of various drawings of some “half ape, half human” creatures appearing in the media and course books, that is, frankly, by means of propaganda, is nothing but a tale with no scientific foundation.

Lord Solly Zuckerman, one of the most famous and respected scientists in the U.K., who carried out research on this subject for years and studied *Australopithecus* fossils for 15 years, finally concluded, despite being an evolutionist himself, that there is, in fact, no such family tree branching out from ape-like creatures to man.

Zuckerman also made an interesting “spectrum of science” ranging from those he considered scientific to those he considered unscientific. According to Zuckerman's spectrum, the most “scientific”—that is, depending on concrete data—fields of science are chemistry and physics. After them come the biological sciences and then the social sciences. At the far end of the spectrum, which is the part considered to be most “unscientific,” are “extra-sensory perception”—concepts such as telepathy and sixth sense—and finally “human evolution.” Zuckerman explains his reasoning:

We then move right off the register of objective truth into those fields of presumed biological science, like extrasensory perception or the interpretation of man's fossil history, where to the faithful [evolutionist] anything is possible—and where the ardent believer [in evolution] is sometimes able to believe several contradictory things at the same time.⁶¹

The tale of human evolution boils down to nothing but the prejudiced interpretations of some fossils unearthed by certain people, who blindly adhere to their theory.

Darwinian Formula!

Besides all the technical evidence we have dealt with so far, let us now for once, examine what kind of a superstition the evolutionists have with an example so simple as to be understood even by children:

The theory of evolution asserts that life is formed by chance. According to this claim, lifeless and unconscious atoms came together to form the cell and then they somehow formed other living things, including man. Let us think about that. When we bring together the elements that are the building-blocks of life such as carbon, phosphorus, nitrogen and potassium, only a heap is formed. No matter what treatments it undergoes, this atomic heap cannot form even a single living being. If you like, let us formulate an “experiment” on this subject and let us examine on the behalf of evolutionists what they really claim without pronouncing loudly under the name “Darwinian formula”:

Let evolutionists put plenty of materials present in the composition of living things such as phosphorus, nitrogen, carbon, oxygen, iron, and magnesium into big barrels. Moreover, let them add in these barrels any material that does not exist under normal conditions, but they think as necessary. Let them add in this mixture as many amino acids—which have no possibility of forming under natural conditions—and as many proteins—a single one of which has a formation probability of 10^{-950} —as they like. Let them expose these mixtures to as much heat and moisture as they like. Let them stir

these with whatever technologically developed device they like. Let them put the foremost scientists beside these barrels. Let these experts wait in turn beside these barrels for billions, and even trillions of years. Let them be free to use all kinds of conditions they believe to be necessary for a human's formation. No matter what they do, they cannot produce from these barrels a human, say a professor that examines his cell structure under the electron microscope. They cannot produce giraffes, lions, bees, canaries, horses, dolphins, roses, orchids, lilies, carnations, bananas, oranges, apples, dates, tomatoes, melons, watermelons, figs, olives, grapes, peaches, peafowls, pheasants, multicoloured butterflies, or millions of other living beings such as these. Indeed, they could not obtain even a single cell of any one of them.

Briefly, unconscious atoms cannot form the cell by coming together. They cannot take a new decision and divide this cell into two, then take other decisions and create the professors who first invent the electron microscope and then examine their own cell structure under that microscope. Matter is an unconscious, lifeless heap, and it comes to life with God's superior creation.

The theory of evolution, which claims the opposite, is a total fallacy completely contrary to reason. Thinking even a little bit on the claims of evolutionists discloses this reality, just as in the above example.

Technology In The Eye And The Ear

Another subject that remains unanswered by evolutionary theory is the excellent quality of perception in the eye and the ear.

Before passing on to the subject of the eye, let us briefly answer the question of how we see. Light rays coming from an object fall oppositely on the eye's retina. Here, these light rays are transmitted into electric signals by cells and reach a tiny spot at the back of the brain, the "center of vision." These electric signals are perceived in this center as an image after a series of processes. With this technical background, let us do some thinking.

The brain is insulated from light. That means that its inside is completely dark, and that no light reaches the place where it is located. Thus, the "center of vision" is never touched by light and may even be the darkest place you have ever known. However, you observe a luminous, bright world in this pitch darkness.

The image formed in the eye is so sharp and distinct that even the technology of the twentieth century has not been able to attain it. For instance, look at the book you are reading, your hands with which you are holding it, and then lift your head and look around you. Have you ever seen such a sharp and distinct image as this one at any other place? Even the most developed television screen produced by the greatest television producer in the world cannot provide such a sharp image for you. This is a three-dimensional, colored, and extremely sharp image. For more than 100 years, thousands of engineers have been trying to achieve this sharpness. Factories, huge premises were

established, much research has been done, plans and designs have been made for this purpose. Again, look at a TV screen and the book you hold in your hands. You will see that there is a big difference in sharpness and distinction. Moreover, the TV screen shows you a two-dimensional image, whereas with your eyes, you watch a three-dimensional perspective with depth.

For many years, tens of thousands of engineers have tried to make a three-dimensional TV and achieve the vision quality of the eye. Yes, they have made a three-dimensional television system, but it is not possible to watch it without putting on special 3-D glasses; moreover, it is only an artificial three-dimension. The background is more blurred, the foreground appears like a paper setting. Never has it been possible to produce a sharp and distinct vision like that of the eye. In both the camera and the television, there is a loss of image quality.

Evolutionists claim that the mechanism producing this sharp and distinct image has been formed by chance. Now, if somebody told you that the television in your room was formed as a result of chance, that all of its atoms just happened to come together and make up this device that produces an image, what would you think? How can atoms do what thousands of people cannot?

If a device producing a more primitive image than the eye could not have been formed by chance, then it is very evident that the eye and the image seen by the eye could not have been formed by chance. The same situation applies to the ear. The outer ear picks up the available sounds by the auricle and directs them to the middle ear, the middle ear transmits the sound vibrations by intensifying them, and the inner ear sends these vibrations to the brain by translating them into electric signals. Just as with the eye, the act of hearing finalizes in the center of hearing in the brain.

The situation in the eye is also true for the ear. That is, the brain is insulated from sound just as it is from light. It does not let any sound in. Therefore, no matter how noisy is the outside, the inside of the brain is completely silent. Nevertheless, the sharpest sounds are perceived in the brain. In your completely silent brain, you listen to symphonies, and hear all of the noises in a crowded place. However, were the sound level in your brain was measured by a precise device at that moment, complete silence would be found to be prevailing there.

As is the case with imagery, decades of effort have been spent in trying to generate and reproduce sound that is faithful to the original. The results of these efforts are sound recorders, high-fidelity systems, and systems for sensing sound. Despite all of this technology and the thousands of engineers and experts who have been working on this endeavor, no sound has yet been obtained that has the same sharpness and clarity as the sound perceived by the ear. Think of the highest-quality hi-fi systems produced by the largest company in the music industry. Even in these devices, when sound is recorded some of it is lost; or when you turn on a hi-fi you always hear a hissing sound before the music starts. However, the sounds that are the products of the human body's

technology are extremely sharp and clear. A human ear never perceives a sound accompanied by a hissing sound or with atmospherics as does a hi-fi; rather, it perceives sound exactly as it is, sharp and clear. This is the way it has been since the creation of man.

So far, no man-made visual or recording apparatus has been as sensitive and successful in perceiving sensory data as are the eye and the ear. However, as far as seeing and hearing are concerned, a far greater truth lies beyond all this.

To Whom Does The Consciousness That Sees And Hears Within The Brain Belong?

Who watches an alluring world in the brain, listens to symphonies and the twittering of birds, and smells the rose?

The stimulations coming from a person's eyes, ears, and nose travel to the brain as electro-chemical nerve impulses. In biology, physiology, and biochemistry books, you can find many details about how this image forms in the brain. However, you will never come across the most important fact: Who perceives these electro-chemical nerve impulses as images, sounds, odors, and sensory events in the brain? There is a consciousness in the brain that perceives all this without feeling any need for an eye, an ear, and a nose. To whom does this consciousness belong? Of course it does not belong to the nerves, the fat layer, and neurons comprising the brain. This is why Darwinist-materialists, who believe that everything is comprised of matter, cannot answer these questions.

For this consciousness is the spirit created by God, which needs neither the eye to watch the images nor the ear to hear the sounds. Furthermore, it does not need the brain to think.

Everyone who reads this explicit and scientific fact should ponder on Almighty God, and fear and seek refuge in Him, for He squeezes the entire universe in a pitch-dark place of a few cubic centimeters in a three-dimensional, colored, shadowy, and luminous form.

A Materialist Faith

The information we have presented so far shows us that the theory of evolution is incompatible with scientific findings. The theory's claim regarding the origin of life is inconsistent with science, the evolutionary mechanisms it proposes have no evolutionary power, and fossils demonstrate that the required intermediate forms have never existed. So, it certainly follows that the theory of evolution should be pushed aside as an unscientific idea. This is how many ideas, such as the Earth-centered universe model, have been taken out of the agenda of science throughout history.

However, the theory of evolution is kept on the agenda of science. Some people even try to represent criticisms directed against it as an "attack on science." Why?

The reason is that this theory is an indispensable dogmatic belief for some circles. These circles are blindly devoted to materialist philosophy and adopt Darwinism because it is the only materialist explanation that can be put forward to explain the workings of nature.

Interestingly enough, they also confess this fact from time to time. A well-known geneticist and an outspoken evolutionist, Richard C. Lewontin from Harvard University, confesses that he is "first and foremost a materialist and then a scientist":

It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced

by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, so we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.⁶²

These are explicit statements that Darwinism is a dogma kept alive just for the sake of adherence to materialism. This dogma maintains that there is no being save matter. Therefore, it argues that inanimate, unconscious matter created life. It insists that millions of different living species (e.g., birds, fish, giraffes, tigers, insects, trees, flowers, whales, and human beings) originated as a result of the interactions between matter such as pouring rain, lightning flashes, and so on, out of inanimate matter. This is a precept contrary both to reason and science. Yet Darwinists continue to defend it just so as “not to allow a Divine Foot in the door.”

Anyone who does not look at the origin of living beings with a materialist prejudice will see this evident truth: All living beings are works of a Creator, Who is All-Powerful, All-Wise, and All-Knowing. This Creator is God, Who created the whole universe from non-existence, designed it in the most perfect form, and fashioned all living beings.

The Theory Of Evolution Is The Most Potent Spell In The World

Anyone free of prejudice and the influence of any particular ideology, who uses only his or her reason and logic, will clearly understand that belief in the theory of evolution, which brings to mind the superstitions of societies with no knowledge of science or civilization, is quite impossible.

As explained above, those who believe in the theory of evolution think that a few atoms and molecules thrown into a huge vat could produce thinking, reasoning professors and university students; such scientists as Einstein and Galileo; such artists as Humphrey Bogart, Frank Sinatra and Luciano Pavarotti; as well as antelopes, lemon trees, and carnations. Moreover, as the scientists and professors who believe in this nonsense are educated people, it is quite justifiable to speak of this theory as “the most potent spell in history.” Never before has any other belief or idea so taken away peoples' powers of reason, refused to allow them to think intelligently and logically and hidden the truth from them as if they had been blindfolded. This is an even worse and unbelievable blindness than the Egyptians worshipping the Sun God Ra, totem worship in some parts of Africa, the people of Saba worshipping the Sun, the tribe of Prophet Abraham (pbuh) worshipping idols they had made with their own hands, or the people of the Prophet Moses (pbuh) worshipping the Golden Calf.

In fact, God has pointed to this lack of reason in the Qur'an. In many verse, He reveals in many verses that some peoples' minds will be closed and that they will be powerless to see the truth. Some of these verses are as follows:

As for those who do not believe, it makes no difference to them whether you warn them or do not warn them, they will not believe. God has sealed up their hearts and hearing and over their eyes is a blindfold. They will have a terrible punishment. (Qur'an, 2: 6-7)

... They have hearts with which they do not understand. They have eyes with which they do not see. They have ears with which they do not hear. Such people are like cattle. No, they are even further astray! They are the unaware. (Qur'an, 7: 179)

Even if We opened up to them a door into heaven, and they spent the day ascending through it, they would only say: "Our eyesight is befuddled! Or rather we have been put under a spell!" (Qur'an, 15: 14-15)

Words cannot express just how astonishing it is that this spell should hold such a wide community in thrall, keep people from the truth, and not be broken for 150 years. It is understandable that one or a few people might believe in impossible scenarios and claims full of stupidity and illogicality. However, "magic" is the only possible explanation for people from all over the world believing that unconscious and lifeless atoms suddenly decided to come together and form a universe that functions with a flawless system of organization, discipline, reason, and consciousness; a planet named Earth with all of its features so perfectly suited to life; and living things full of countless complex systems.

In fact, the Qur'an relates the incident of Prophet Moses and Pharaoh to show that some people who support atheistic philosophies actually influence others by magic. When Pharaoh was told about the true religion, he told Prophet Moses to meet with his own magicians. When Moses did so, he told them to demonstrate their abilities first. The verses continue:

He said: "You throw." And when they threw, they cast a spell on the people's eyes and caused them to feel great fear of them. They produced an extremely powerful magic. (Qur'an, 7: 116)

As we have seen, Pharaoh's magicians were able to deceive everyone, apart from Moses and those who believed in him. However, his evidence broke the spell, or "swallowed up what they had forged," as the verse puts it.

We revealed to Moses, "Throw down your staff." And it immediately swallowed up what they had forged. So the Truth took place and what they did was shown to be false. (Qur'an, 7: 117-118)

As we can see, when people realized that a spell had been cast upon them and that what they saw was just an illusion, Pharaoh's magicians lost all credibility. In the present day too, unless those who, under the influence of a similar spell, believe in these ridiculous claims under their scientific disguise and spend their lives defending them, abandon their superstitious beliefs, they also will be humiliated when the full truth emerges and the spell is broken. In fact, world-renowned British writer and philosopher Malcolm Muggeridge also stated this:

I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books in the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has.⁶³

That future is not far off: On the contrary, people will soon see that "chance" is not a deity, and will look back on the theory of evolution as the worst deceit and the most terrible spell in the world. That spell is already rapidly beginning to be lifted from the shoulders of people all over the world. Many people who see its true face are wondering with amazement how they could ever have been taken in by it.

**They said "Glory be to You! We have no
knowledge except what You have thought us.
You are the All-Knowing, the All-Wise."
(Qur'an, 2: 32)**

NOTES

1. R. C. Sproul, *Not A Chance*, The Myth of Chance in Modern Science & Cosmology, Baker Books, 3rd ed., USA, 1997, p. 9.
2. Ibid., p. 8, [*Jaki, God and the Cosmologists*, p. 149; Pierre Delbet, *La Science et la réalité*, Paris: Flammarion, 1913, p. 238].
3. William Dembski, *Mere Creation*, Science, Faith & Intelligent Design, InterVarsity Press, USA, 1998, p. 194.
4. Irene Maxine Pepperberg, *The Alex Studies*, Harvard University Press, England, 1999, pp. 46-47.
5. <http://www.linguistlist.org/~ask-ling/archive-1997.10/msg01480.html>
6. http://www.eeb.uconn.edu/courses/Ornithology/EEB281_1_Vocalizations.htm
7. Lesley J. Rogers & Gisela Kaplan, *Songs, Roars and Rituals*, Communication In Birds, Mammals and Other Animals, USA, 2000, p. 81.
8. <http://instruct1.cit.cornell.edu/courses/bionb424/students/mdr17/neurophysiology.html>
9. <http://www.earthlife.net/birds/hearing.html>
10. Theodore Xenophon Barber, *Phd., The Human Nature of Birds*, USA, 1993, p. 36.
11. Ibid., p. 37.
12. <http://www.alexfoundation.org/research/articles/birdsusa.html>; Irene M. Pepperberg, Ph.D., Robyn J. Bright, *Birds*, USA, 1990 Annual.
13. <http://www.alexfoundation.org>
14. Lesley J. Rogers & Gisela Kaplan, *Songs, Roars and Rituals*, Communication In Birds, Mammals and Other Animals, USA, 2000, p. 72.
15. Irene Maxine Pepperberg, *The Alex Studies*, Harvard University Press, England, 1999; <http://www.alexfoundation.org/research/articles/harvard/harvard.html>
16. "Parrots may be smart as chimps and dolphins," The Augusta Chronicle; http://www.augustachronicle.com/stories/110897/tech_parrots.html
17. Lesley J. Rogers & Gisela Kaplan, *Songs, Roars and Rituals*, Communication In Birds, Mammals and Other Animals, USA, 2000, p. 71.
18. http://luscinia.biologie.fu-berlin.de/research/maintop/memory_eng.html
19. Theodore Xenophon Barber, *Phd., The Human Nature of Birds*, USA, 1993, p.10.
20. Theodore Xenophon Barber, *Phd., The Human Nature of Birds*, USA, 1993, pp. 4-5.
21. Theodore Xenophon Barber, *Phd., The Human Nature of Birds*, USA, 1993, p. 6.
22. Ibid., pp. 79-80.
23. Ibid., p. 80.
24. Ibid., p. 34.

25. Lesley J. Rogers & Gisela Kaplan, *Songs, Roars and Rituals*, Communication In Birds, Mammals and Other Animals, USA, 2000, pp. 78-79.
- 26.http://whalonlab.msu.edu/Student_Webpages/Bird_song/page
- 27.http://whalonlab.msu.edu/Student_Webpages/Bird_song/page
- 28.<http://www.dukemagazine.duke.edu/dukemag/issues/111201/brain.html>
- 29.<http://www.dukemagazine.duke.edu/dukemag/issues/111201/brain.html>
- 30.<http://www.dukemagazine.duke.edu/dukemag/issues/111201/brain.html>
31. Coates M. 1991. New palaeontological contributions to limb ontogeny and phylogeny. In: J. R. Hinchcliffe (ed.) *Developmental Patterning of the Vertebrate Limb* 325-337. New York: Plenum Press; Coates M. I. 1996. The Devonian tetrapod *Acanthostega gunnari* Jarvik: postcranial anatomy, basal tetrapod interrelationships and patterns of skeletal evolution. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 87: 363-421.
32. William Fix, *The Bone Peddlers: Selling Evolution*, Macmillan Publishing Co., New York, 1984, p. 189.
33. Elizabeth Pennisi, "*Microbes, Immunity, and Disease: Is It Time to Uproot the Tree of Life?*" *Science*, Vol. 284, no. 5418, 21 May 1999, pp. 1305-1307.
34. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, Regnery Publishing, 2000, s. 51.
- 35.<http://www.icb.ufmg.br/~lbem/aulas/grad/tge/biodiv/birdslanguage.html>
- 36.<http://www.dukemagazine.duke.edu/dukemag/issues/111201/brain2.html>
- 37.<http://www.dukemagazine.duke.edu/dukemag/issues/111201/brain.html>
38. Philip Lieberman, "Peak Capacity," *The Sciences*, 37:27, November/ December, 1997.
39. <http://members.aol.com/rmallott2/origin.htm>; *The Origin of Language*: The General Problem, Cracow, 1986; Thorpe, W.H., "Animal vocalisation and communication. In *Brain Mechanisms Underlying Speech and Language*," Grune & Stratton, New York, 1967, pp. 11.
- 40.http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in_depth/sci_tech/2002/boston_2002/1821654.stm
- 41.http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in_depth/sci_tech/2002/boston_2002/1821654.stm
- 42.<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/2178920.stm>

43. Andrew Cawthorne, *"Betty the Crow Proves She's No Bird-Brain,"* 9 August, 2002, London, Reuters.
44. Michael Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, p. 228.
45. Sidney Fox, Klaus Dose, *Molecular Evolution and The Origin of Life*, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1972, p. 4.
46. Alexander I. Oparin, *Origin of Life*, Dover Publications, New York, 1936, 1953 (reprint), p. 196.
47. "New Evidence on Evolution of Early Atmosphere and Life", Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, vol 63, November 1982, p. 1328-1330.
48. Stanley Miller, *Molecular Evolution of Life: Current Status of the Prebiotic Synthesis of Small Molecules*, 1986, p. 7.
49. Jeffrey Bada, *Earth*, February 1998, p. 40.
50. Leslie E. Orgel, *"The Origin of Life on Earth"*, Scientific American, vol. 271, October 1994, p. 78.
51. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, The Modern Library, New York, p. 127.
52. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 184.
53. B. G. Ranganathan, *Origins?*, Pennsylvania: The Banner Of Truth Trust, 1988, p. 7.
54. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 179.
55. Derek A. Ager, *"The Nature of the Fossil Record"*, Proceedings of the British Geological Association, vol 87, 1976, p. 133.
56. Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1983. p. 197.
57. Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, Toplinger Publications, New York, 1970, pp. 75-14; Charles E. Oxnard, *"The Place of Australopithecines in Human Evolution: Grounds for Doubt"*, Nature, vol 258, p. 389.
58. *"Could science be brought to an end by scientists' belief that they have final answers or by society's reluctance to pay the bills?"* Scientific American, December 1992, p. 20.
59. Alan Walker, *Science*, vol. 207, 7 March 1980, p. 1103; A. J. Kelso, *Physical Antropology*, 1st ed., J. B. Lipincott Co., New York, 1970, p. 221; M. D. Leakey, *Olduvai Gorge*, vol. 3, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1971, p. 272.
60. Jeffrey Kluger, *"Not So Extinct After All: The Primitive Homo Erectus May Have Survived Long Enough To Coexist With Modern Humans"*, Time, 23 December 1996.
61. S. J. Gould, *Natural History*, vol. 85, 1976, p. 30.
62. Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, p. 19.
63. Richard Lewontin, *"The Demon-Haunted World,"* The New York Review of Books, January 9, 1997, p. 28.
64. Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, p. 43.

Back cover

Some bird species have a talent rarely found in any other creature except man. The best example of this are parrots, which can imitate, in addition to human speech, a wide range of sounds that even humans can't duplicate convincingly—for example, as the creaking of a door, the cap being removed from a bottle, a ringing telephone, or a tune being whistled. This talent to imitate, observable in parrots and some other bird species, is not an ability that can be acquired by coincidence. All the wondrous characteristics of birds that can imitate sounds are just part of the evidence God shows to man so we may witness the magnificence of His creation.

In this book you will discover that talking birds use a frequency modulation (FM) system, the working system of the AM radios found in nearly all homes, that birds' sound recognition capacity is some 10 times greater than that of humans, that birds can distinguish 10 different notes and many other astonishing facts. You will see that the way these creatures are equipped with the ability to speak and imitate sounds is one of the countless miracles of creation, and at the same time witness how that ability completely undermines the theory of evolution.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

The author, who writes under the pen-name Harun Yahya, was born in Ankara in 1956. He studied arts at Istanbul's Mimar Sinan University, and philosophy at Istanbul University. Since the 1980s, the author has published many books on political, faith-related and scientific issues. His main focus has been the refutation of Darwinism and materialism, two modern myths presented under a scientific guise. Harun Yahya's books appeal to all kinds of readers, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, regardless of their age, race, or nationality, for they focus on one objective: to broaden the readers' perspective by encouraging them to think about a number of critical issues, such as the existence of God and His unity, and to display the decrepit foundations and perverted works of godless systems.

