

TTMCLS – Things That Make Christians Look Stupid – Mr. Hinton’s article on Whiskers

By Greg Neyman

© 2006, Old Earth Ministries



Answers In Creation Website

www.answersincreation.org/ttmcls.htm

One of the series of articles on Creation Science Evangelism (CSE) website (the “Hovind” site) is creatively titled “Things that make evolutionists look stupid” (TTMELS for short). The subtitle then goes on to introduce the topic for the article. With a title like this, I knew what to expect without even reading the article...an emotional appeal, with no real scientific evidence. The first article I looked at, Whiskers,” did not let me down, as it had no scientific evidence at all. ¹

Whiskers

In his discussion, he makes it sound like his dog's whiskers help it to not get hit in the face when the dog is running through the woods. This is only partially true. A dog's whiskers "may" help him judge distances, as studies with cats whiskers which are shortened did reveal that it can affect their judgment of distances (I'm not aware of any similar studies in dogs). However, the main thing protecting the dog from running into objects is the dog's eyesight. Whiskers are mainly an aid in low light situations, and at slow speeds. If a dog is running full speed through the woods, and its whisker hits a branch, its too late to change directions...the dog will hit the branch.

It is funny to note that he claims reptiles do not have whiskers because they move more slowly, or let their prey come to them. Actually, reptiles don't have them because reptiles don't have [hair](#) (only mammals have hair).

Another odd claim is this one...*"It should be pointed out that horses and other primarily meadow-grazing animals do not need or have whiskers."* I have a horse, and she has whiskers (here's a [picture of her whiskers](#)). Perhaps if Hinton owned a horse, he would know this. A simple search at Google for "horse whiskers" will give you plenty of

advice on clipping/caring for your horse's whiskers. He comes back to this argument at the end, about how meadow-grazing animals got rid of their whiskers. If Hinton did any research for this article, it is astounding that he would not have discovered that horses have whiskers...this only goes to show the quality of young earth scientific work.

Hinton presents no scientific data in support of his cause, and instead presents false scientific information on reptiles and horses. Instead of science, he resorts to a God of the Gaps argument..."it's a wonderful feature...God must have done it." Unfortunately, such arguments are emotion-based, not fact-based. For a discussion on what a God of the gaps argument is, check out [this article](#).

We must be careful when arguing from this position. We are basically arguing that since there is no evidence for evolution, then God must be the answer...we are essentially arguing based on a lack of evidence. While I agree that many intricate designs in nature are indicative of a creator, the evolutionist is not so inclined, and will see our appeal to the divine as a weakness on our part.

As with spiders (see article link below), there are two possible approaches concerning whiskers. For progressive creationists, who believe that God created each species unique, Hinton's arguments present no problems whatsoever. For theistic evolutionists, with God involved in the evolutionary process, everything else is not important. Considering that God instituted the natural laws guiding evolution, and possibly helped out along the way, then features such as whiskers present no obstacles.

How does Hinton characterize evolutionists in this article? Here is a quote:

Next time you pet your dog or cat, think about how miraculous those whiskers are and how they help make evolutionists look stupid.

This is a strange way to try and reach evolutionists with the gospel...by insulting them, calling them stupid. Actually, with Hinton's ignorance of horses, reptiles, and whiskers, he is the one who ends up looking stupid.

In order to confront CSE on the issue of their article series, I sent the following comment to them:

Your series of articles, with the title TTMELS (Things that makes evolutionists look stupid), would seem to be counterproductive to winning souls. If we are to love the unsaved, and win them for Christ, calling them stupid will only drive them further away. Using such terms is actually helping the enemy, Satan, and not Christ. As a Christian, I have to wonder whose side you are on. You should consider removing these articles, or rewriting them. In essence, they make Christians look stupid.

I'm still waiting on a response from CSE.

Unfortunately, this type of argument is characteristic of much young earth creationist literature...and especially that coming from Kent Hovind and friends. Whereas Answers in Genesis and the Institute for Creation Research attempt to use science, Hovind uses nothing but emotional arguments, which are easy to see through. Thus, the title TTMCLS applies to Hovind and friends (Things That Make Christians Look Stupid).

Perhaps that is why Answers in Genesis has distanced itself from Mr. Hovind's ministry.

Conclusion

If we are to love the unsaved, and win them for Christ, calling them "stupid" is not the proper way to do it. This will turn more away from the Gospel, and harden their hearts. Driving them away from the Gospel is working against Christ. Hovind and Hinton appear to be working against Christ.

¹ www.drdino.com/articles.php?spec=94