Standing on the Word: Faith, Science, and Worldviews

Dr. Jason Lisle on Biblical Authority, Morality, Scientific Assumptions, and Defending the Faith

Dr. Jason Lisle | Wednesday, October 14, 2026 | Host: Mark Burns

Program Summary

In this concluding archived conversation originally recorded in July 2012, Mark Burns and Pastor Jason Schiffo speak with astrophysicist Dr. Jason Lisle, then serving at the Institute for Creation Research. Dr. Lisle argues from a presuppositional Christian apologetics perspective that Scripture provides the necessary foundation for logic, morality, and scientific investigation. He explains why he does not set the Bible aside when discussing origins, and describes 'rescuing devices'—supplementary hypotheses people use to preserve their existing worldview. The conversation ranges across comets, ocean salinity, dinosaurs, genetic similarity, and the then-recent Higgs boson discovery. Many scientific claims are disputed or inconsistent with mainstream scientific evidence, and the program is best understood as a historical presentation of Lisle's views, not a current scientific consensus report. Mark closes by encouraging listeners to study God's Word and explain their hope in Christ with gentleness and respect.

Key Takeaways

• Colossians 2:3 places wisdom and knowledge in Christ, establishing the program's spiritual theme.

• Dr. Lisle argues that worldview commitments shape how people interpret evidence and decide what counts as an explanation.

• His presuppositional apologetics begins with Scripture rather than attempting to reason from a religiously neutral starting point.

• The conversation connects morality and human dignity with the biblical teaching that people bear God's image.

• Listeners can distinguish an observation, an interpretation, and the assumptions that connect them.

• Dr. Lisle uses 'rescuing device' for an additional explanation invoked to preserve a larger theory; he acknowledges Christians use them too.

• The interview's comet, ocean-salt, dinosaur, and genetic arguments reflect Lisle's young-earth creationist position, not established scientific conclusions.

• The Higgs boson discussion reflects the scientific news and understanding of the original 2012 recording.

• Firm Christian conviction and careful, respectful conversation need not be opposites.

• The closing pastoral invitation is to know Scripture, ask honest questions, and explain Christian hope with gentleness and respect.

Scripture References

• Colossians 2:3

• 1 Peter 3:15

• Romans 1:18–21

• Genesis 1:26–27

• Genesis 8:22

• Proverbs 1:7

• Isaiah 55:6–9

• 2 Timothy 4:2

• Proverbs 26:4–5

Quote of the Day

“You can’t defend biblical authority by abandoning biblical authority.” — Dr. Jason Lisle

Broadcast Notes

This is Part Two of a two-day archive presentation, not a newly recorded 2026 interview. The original recording is identified as July 2012. Pastor Jason Schiffo opens with a question about morality and a conversation with a friend, prompting Dr. Lisle to describe his understanding of the image of God and moral accountability. The interview then addresses his view that the Bible must remain the starting point for Christian apologetics. He describes presuppositional reasoning, critiques religious neutrality, and argues that logic and science presuppose the Christian worldview. Dr. Lisle next introduces 'rescuing devices' and applies the idea to the hypothetical Oort Cloud, comets, and the accumulation of ocean salts. He discusses dinosaur history and children's educational media, followed by then-current ICR research projects and the Higgs boson. These are faithfully preserved as the speaker's arguments, not independently verified facts; modern scientific consensus supports an approximately 4.54-billion-year-old Earth, an approximately 13.8-billion-year-old universe, evolutionary common descent, and non-avian dinosaur extinction long before humans. The interview's historical context and disputed interpretations should remain clear. Mark's closing emphasis is on Scripture, learning, and 1 Peter 3:15's gentleness and respect.

❤■ Practical Applications

• Read Colossians 2:3 and thank Jesus for the wisdom and understanding available in Him.

• Before debating an issue, ask which assumptions I and the other person are bringing to it.

• Separate what was observed from what is inferred, and remain open to examining the evidence.

• Practice describing a different worldview accurately before offering a critique.

• Remember that disagreement never cancels another person's dignity as God's image-bearer.

• Ask whether I am protecting a favorite conclusion with assumptions I have not examined.

• Check scientific claims against current, credible research rather than assuming an archived discussion reflects the latest evidence.

• Prepare a brief explanation of my hope in Christ and practice sharing it gently.

• Choose one sincere question to ask someone with whom I disagree.

• Pray for wisdom to be both confident in faith and humble about my own limitations.

Today's Challenge

For seven days, read 1 Peter 3:15 and Colossians 2:3. Write a two-minute explanation of why Jesus gives you hope. Then discuss one important question with a friend: identify the assumptions involved, listen carefully, distinguish evidence from interpretation, and respond with gentleness and respect. Where the topic is scientific, consult up-to-date sources as well as the archived interview.

Closing Prayer

Father, thank You that in Christ are hidden the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Teach me to love Your Word and to seek understanding with a humble heart. When I encounter questions about science, morality, and faith, help me listen carefully, think clearly, and distinguish what I know from what I still need to learn. Keep me from pride, careless assumptions, or dismissing people who disagree with me. Give me courage to speak about Jesus and the hope I have in Him, but always with gentleness and respect. May my words reflect Your truth and my attitude reflect Your love. Guide me into greater faithfulness today. In Jesus' name, Amen.

About Today's Speaker

Dr. Jason Lisle is an astrophysicist and Christian author known for young-earth creationist apologetics and his writing on biblical authority, logic, and worldviews. At the time of this July 2012 interview, he served with the Institute for Creation Research. The archived conversation reflects his ministry and scientific interpretations at that time.

About Today's Host

Mark Burns is General Manager of the WLUJ Family of Stations and Great News Radio Network and host of Mark & Friends. Through decades of Christian radio ministry, he brings biblical teaching, testimony, and conversations intended to encourage listeners in their walk with Jesus. Pastor Jason Schiffo joins him as co-host for this archived interview.

Proofread Broadcast Transcript

10 14 2026

We're glad you're here. We're glad you're here. Fellowship is sweeter, knowing you're near.

It's so good to see you. We hope that it's clear. Everyone loves you.

We're glad you're here. Reading from Colossians 2, verse 3, speaking of Christ, In whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. That was Colossians 2, verse 3. O magnify the Lord with me, let us exalt his name together.

It's Wednesday, October 14th, 2026, and welcome to Mark & Friends. Today we're continuing a special two-day interview from our archives with astrophysicist Dr. Jason Lisle, who is then serving with the Institute for Creation Research. Yesterday we heard about his Christian upbringing, his education, and the importance he places on the biblical account of creation.

Today, along with Pastor Jason Schiffo, we'll explore how our beliefs shape the way we understand science, morality, and the world around us. And as you listen, remember that this conversation was recorded some years ago, so some scientific references and ministry updates reflect that time. If you missed yesterday's program, you'll find it under the Mark & Friends tab at GreatNewsRadio.org or WLUJ.org. We'll start today's broadcast right where we left off yesterday, as my co-host Pastor Jason Schiffo will make a few comments and ask a question of Dr. Jason Lisle.

I think that one of your talks that I watched a few weeks ago, you said something that made me laugh, and you referenced Richard Dawkins. And you said, isn't it interesting that what brings Richard Dawkins the most meaning to his life is to try and continually prove that life has absolutely no meaning? And that just struck me, and I said, it just makes sense. In fact, I even had a conversation two days ago with a friend of mine who is a Christian.

He says, look, I've got all these problems. I'm not sure how I feel about the Old Testament. I'm not sure.

I'm really wrestling with these things. And then he started to tell me, and really opting towards an evolutionary worldview, he started to then tell me, lament about something in the paper, a murder. And I said, well, why does that make you – I mean, I used almost your argument.

I said, well, why does that make you mad? I mean, that's just vinegar. And I forget what the example was he used. I was much more on point then.

But I said, that's just a chemical reaction. I mean, one thing taking care of another. Why would that make you upset unless you have morals? And if you have a moral worldview, then where did that come from? And it was like you saw a light kind of

come on.

Yes. See, evolutionists know in their heart of hearts, they know the God of creation. And the Bible tells us that in Romans 1. It tells us that God has made himself known to everyone.

And that means that there's no excuse when the unbeliever denies God. He might say, oh, I'm an atheist. I don't believe in God.

Or maybe he does believe in some sort of God, but he believes that God worked through evolution. But the fact is, when push comes to shove, they know that murder's wrong. And the reason murder's wrong is because we're made in the image of God, and that goes back to creation.

So it's very bad when somebody kills another person. That's contrary to God's command. But if we really were just rearranged pond scum, then, yeah, it's just one chemical reacting with another chemical.

Like you said, the illustration I like to use is baking soda and vinegar. When you react those two, they fizz up. You don't get mad.

You don't say, bad baking soda. You shouldn't have done that. It's just a chemical reaction.

Chemistry does what chemistry does. And so if we're just chemistry, it doesn't make sense to be angry at someone for what they do. They're just working out the chemical reactions that happen to take place in their brains.

It's not like they have any choice in the matter, not in an evolutionary universe that's all deterministic and so. But in the biblical worldview, God does hold us accountable for actions. And so I can say as a Christian, I can say, well, that is wrong when somebody murders somebody else because it's contrary to the command of God.

We're made in God's image. We're not just rearranged pond scum. We're fearfully and wonderfully made.

You talk a lot, Jason, about those rescuing devices. But even before we get there, there's something that I think that we need to preface this with that you talk a lot about. And I hear Christians do it all the time.

They have arguments or discussions with their atheist friends, and they come to a point where they say, well, let's just leave the Bible out of it. Let's just discuss the cold hard science or let's just discover the philosophy of it. Let's just discuss that part of it, but let's leave that out because that's the thing that we both don't agree on.

And why can't we do that? Wow, yeah, it's a whopping big mistake, and it's one that Christians make all the time, unfortunately. The Bible is our foundation, first of all. The Bible is what makes logic, science, and so on possible.

And so if we say, well, we're leaving the Bible out of it, we're leaving out the foundation for the very science that we're allegedly going to discuss. And so it's irrational. Secondly, it's immoral because the Bible itself tells us we're not to do that.

The Bible tells us we're to stand fast on the word. We're to preach it in season and out of season. And so if somebody says, I don't believe in the Bible, what I should be thinking, and I'm not going to say it quite this way, what I'm thinking is, well, that's foolish.

You know, you want to talk about the origins and you want to leave out the only record we have of origins? That's ridiculous. If you don't believe in the Bible, that's your problem. Don't make it my problem.

The Bible tells us that we're not to answer a fool according to his folly. When somebody has that belief that the Bible's not the word of God or that it should be left out of discussion, that person, according to Scripture, is a fool. And I'm not just name-calling.

I'm not saying they're an idiot or that they're stupid, but their worldview is foolish. They have a silly belief. And if we agree to those terms, we've pretty much lost the debate at that point.

First of all, we've disobeyed Scripture. And secondly, we've pretty much lost the debate because the debate really is about whether or not the Bible is the ultimate standard. That's really what all these debates are about.

Is the Bible really true? If the Bible's true, then the origins debate's settled. Creation's true. There's no doubt because that's what the Bible teaches.

And so when someone says, leave the Bible out of discussion, they've said, basically, you need to give up your argument. And if you do that, you say, okay, well, you've pretty much lost. You can't defend biblical authority by abandoning biblical authority.

And that's the point that I really want to get across to people is it's not a good idea to leave the Bible out of the discussion. And because it is, after all, the word of God. Now, in addition to the Bible, you can certainly use scientific evidence to show how the Bible makes sense of it.

But if somebody says, well, I don't believe in the Bible, you need to challenge them and say, well, why not? What is your good, solid reasoning for rejecting what we know to be historical eyewitness testimony? And they're not going to have a good reason for that. And by the way, the evolutionist believes in evolution while he defends it. Of course, you need to stand on the word of God while you're defending it.

That's the best place to be. In battle, you can stand on a hill while you're defending the hill. That's the best place to be.

We need to stand on the Bible when we're defending the Bible. That's the best way to do it, and it's the way the Bible tells us to do it. And most atheists would argue back and say, but don't do that.

Don't stand on the Bible and defend it, because that's circular reasoning, correct? They'll say that. Meanwhile, they're standing on evolution while they're defending it. They're reasoning in the same way.

And they'll say, maybe we can meet on neutral ground. But the Bible says there is no neutral ground. The Bible says, Jesus said, if you're not for me, you're against me.

If you don't gather, you're scattering. And so there is no neutral ground. You're either taking the position that God's word is true, or you're taking the position that it's false.

There's not this in-between position that people think. What we need to do is, I'm going to stand on my position. You stand on your position.

And let's discuss and see the implications of each of these positions. Because I contend that your position is irrational. Your position doesn't make sense.

If you don't stand on the word of God, you cannot make sense of logic, science, morality, or really anything else. You cannot make sense of the world in which we live from an evolutionary perspective. It just doesn't make sense.

It's not rational. I love how you've simply stated this. I love God's word.

I've read it my whole life. And I believe it's true. It's inspired.

It's inerrant. And I read it very literally, obviously, when it's meant to be read literally. And I just take it at face value.

But the fact that we don't have to be not only ashamed of the gospel, but we can stand, as the song says, stand on the promises, stand on God's word, and not to be defensive about it. And I like how you turn the argument around. You say to the atheist, well, what do you find wrong? What are the contradictions that you think are there? And just to be confident that we don't have to discard it and we don't have to take it out of the equation.

No, I believe in the biblical account, and here's why. And so for that listener that maybe has never entertained that idea, and I do this, I have a lot of atheist friends, and they're decent people, but I say, gosh, you have more faith than me to believe that we just have no meaning and purpose. And I always love to say primordial slime, because, you know, but that's really their frame of mind.

But you're saying, Mark, the Bible has to be a part of your argument. You know, what it really comes down to is belief in the Bible is entirely rational. And disbelief in the Bible is irrational.

There is no logical reason to reject the Bible. It's an historical document. It's not just any historical document, though.

It's one that claims to be the inspired word of God. And if that really is the inspired word of God, it would be ridiculous. It would be just downright silly to start with anything else as our foundation.

I mean, let's face it. We're finite human beings. We don't know everything.

We make guesses about stuff, but we can be wrong. See, our minds are not up to the challenge of being our own ultimate standard, because we don't know everything. We can make mistakes.

We're finite. We're fallible. But if we have a source of information from Almighty God who never makes mistakes, who knows everything, if we have an inerrant source of revelation, it would be absurd to take anything else as our ultimate standard.

And so it is not the Christian who's being irrational and defending his belief. It's the evolutionist who's being irrational and defending his. And that's the thing that I like to point out to people, is you need to defend your belief, too.

I can defend my belief. Mine makes sense of the very things we all take for granted, logic and science and morality. But I contend that any alternative to Christianity cannot make sense of those things.

It'll be arbitrary, and it'll be inconsistent on its own terms. And I've never had anybody be able to come back from that kind of argument. It's a very, very powerful argument.

And it really is something that the Bible itself tells us, because the Bible tells us the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge, according to Proverbs 1, 7. And it says, but fools despise wisdom and instruction. So if you start from God's Word, that's the only way you can have knowledge, is by starting with the biblical God as revealed in His Word. That doesn't mean you necessarily have to have read the Bible to have knowledge, but it does mean the Bible has to be true in order for knowledge to be possible.

We have to have a God who has consistent logical thoughts that are reflected in what we call laws of logic. You'd have to have a God who upholds the universe in a consistent fashion so that we can have laws of nature and do things like science. You couldn't get up in the morning without laws of nature, right? Imagine you get up in the morning, and gravity sends you hurtling toward the ceiling.

Well, that doesn't happen. We know that God causes things to move down, that God causes what we call gravity, and He does that in a consistent way that we can count on. And that's why science is possible.

But apart from the Christian worldview, none of these things would make any sense. You can't have rationality. You can't have science apart from the Christian worldview.

So when we're having these conversations, now I know you always point to in your books, The Ultimate Proof of Creation, these rescuing devices that both Christians and atheists would use. Could you expound on that and maybe explain to our listeners what a rescuing device is and what some might be? Yeah, a rescuing device is when you try to protect your worldview from what appears to be contrary evidence. And so, for example, comets.

Comets are an indication that the solar system is very young. It's not billions of years old, it's thousands of years old, as the Bible teaches, because comets don't last very long. Comets are made of ice, and when they come close to the sun, which they inevitably do, some of that icy material is blasted into space.

And so you can calculate the maximum age of a comet, and it's something like 100,000 years for a typical comet. And my secular astronomers are aware of that. They know that comets don't last very long, and so they say, well, there must be a comet generator that makes new ones, which they call the Oort Cloud.

Nobody's ever seen this Oort Cloud. It's purely hypothetical, but it is what I would call a rescuing device. Because, you see, comets, apart from the Oort Cloud, comets would be evidence for a young solar system.

But they say, well, we can't have that. We believe in the solar system that's 4.5 billion years old, and so they have to invoke this other belief to protect their main belief. And so it's kind of a secondary belief that protects your main worldview, your main belief, and so that's a rescuing device.

Now, we have them, too. And I don't want to pretend that only evolutionists have rescuing devices. I think they have more of them.

But Christians have them, too, because we don't know everything. And so if somebody comes to you, and they have some alleged contradiction in the Bible, maybe a verse that you're not terribly familiar with, and you don't know how to answer it right away, your first inclination is not to say, well, yeah, I guess the Bible could be wrong. Maybe I should throw that away and become an atheist.

Your first inclination is to say, well, you know, I know the Bible is the Word of God, so there is an explanation for this. Give me time, and I'll find it. And so we all have rescuing devices.

We can always propose a mechanism to protect our worldview. Nothing wrong with that. But we need to get beyond those and deal with the actual worldviews and say, now, wait a minute, why is it you secular astronomers believe that the solar system is 4.5 billion years old? What is your reason for that? And ultimately we'll find it's based in naturalism, and I'm going to ask, what is the reason for that? And they won't have a good reason for that.

It'll come back to an arbitrary axiom in the case of secular worldviews, and it'll come back to the Word of God and the Christian worldview. And when people ask me why I believe in the Word of God, I'm going to say because it can account for all those things that we take for granted, like laws of logic and science and so on, and no other worldview can. And I'm solid on that because the Bible itself says the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge.

It's only in God that we can know things. In Colossians 2, 3, in Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Everything that's known is known by God and is in Him, and it's only through biblical thinking, a biblical worldview, that you can actually have knowledge and logic and science.

You mentioned the comet as an example, and they don't have the long life. I think you said maybe 100,000 years, but I was thinking… Yeah, maximum. I have kind of always bought in or understood the young earth, and so how could you say 100,000 years? So how do you look at the creation or the biblical account of the seven days or literally seven days or the young earth? If a comet could be 100,000 years old, do you subscribe to comics being that old? Oh, I should explain.

That's an upper limit on the age. Basically, given the amount of mass in a typical comet and given the rate at which that mass is depleted, that's the upper limit for an age. They could be much younger than that.

Another example would be salt in the ocean. We know the rate at which salt… The oceans are actually getting saltier because they pick up a little bit of… Rivers pick up a little bit of salt from the land, dump it into the ocean. The water evaporates, but it leaves the salt.

And so oceans get a little saltier every year. And if you run the calculation backwards, you find that oceans can be a maximum of… I forget what the number. I think it's 50 million years old, which sounds like a lot, but evolutionists believe the oceans are 3 billion years old.

And so they obviously… Obviously, the evolutionary view cannot be right because it's got an internal inconsistency. But you say, well, 50 million years, that's assuming they started as freshwater, which I don't believe. I believe they started almost as salt as they are now.

So they're actually about 6,000 years old. Whenever we do these kinds of age estimations, we're usually looking at an upper limit. And that's just to show that there's an inconsistency in the evolutionary or secular way of thinking about things.

Because generally the secular scientist is operating from a lot of assumptions, aren't they? Yeah. Anytime you do something about the past, you can't observe it directly. You can't… You can't go back in time and see it.

And so you're going to have to make some assumptions about the past. The only exception would be if we have eyewitness testimony, which for the Bible we have. We have… The creationists are the only ones that have eyewitness testimony of what actually happened back at the beginning.

We're the only ones that can say as a matter of fact, we know how the universe was created because we have historical documentation on it. Anybody else is guessing. And ultimately when they make those guesses, they're going to involve a lot

of assumptions involving rates and so on.

People talk about radiometric dating and things like that, but that involves a lot of assumptions about rates and about initial conditions and so on. What we like to do then as creationists is we'll say we'll temporarily assume the secular system just for the sake of argument and show that it leads to inconsistency. So for example, secularists tend to believe that rates and conditions are constant.

That's a belief called uniformitarianism. Now I don't believe that because I believe in the Genesis flood and I believe that rates and conditions on Earth were drastically affected during that flood year. But for the sake of argument I could say even assuming that rates and conditions are constant, we know that salt fills the oceans at such and such a rate, working backwards, the Earth can't be billions of years old because the oceans would have been fresh water 50 million years ago and you can't have less salt than no salt.

So they can't be older than that. And of course they could be much younger if you start with the assumption that the oceans had some salt in them to begin with. So what we're really doing, and we probably need to elaborate on this more clearly, what we're doing is we're temporarily assuming the secular assumptions to show that it leads to an inconsistency.

That even given their assumptions, you have ages, maximum ages, that are much less than what their timescale requires. But maximum ages that are consistent with the biblical timescale because a maximum age is consistent with an age that's much less than that. And I want to bring it right home for me, Jason, and maybe get some of your thoughts on this.

And this really came out too when we talked to Mark Lloyd earlier in the week. He touched on this and it really got my wheels turning. But I have a six-year-old son and we recently went to the Creation Museum and it was a blessing in terms of my son because he's a fanatic about dinosaurs.

He's got all kinds of dinosaur books on his shelf. He's got these little dinosaur figures and they eat his superheroes all the time. It's a good time.

But I found as I was reading the books with him and every night before we go to bed we'd read some of his dinosaur books before we'd pray and we'd read maybe the Bible together. And I got this feeling that evolutionists were using dinosaurs as a great way to indoctrinate my kids into the idea of evolution. Because dinosaurs are so popular for kids and these books kids just want to pour over.

I mean, they love it. I'd love to have your thoughts on that. Oh, it's absolutely true.

Absolutely true. And it starts very, very young, too. I happened to be flipping the channels not too long ago.

I think it was a Saturday morning and there was some children's show, like Dinosaur Train or something like that. And it had evolution in it. I couldn't believe it.

It's obviously geared for very, very young children. And it was teaching them evolution. And I thought, what a shame.

I mean, they don't have a chance, hardly. They're brainwashed before they're even in kindergarten. They're brainwashed into believing in evolution.

And it's because dinosaurs are so fascinating that I believe evolutionists try to use that as a tool to brainwash them. Here's the neat thing, though. We can use dinosaurs to tell people the truth about creation.

And that's one of the things that's implemented at the Creation Museum that I really appreciate. Lots of dinosaurs there. And we show dinosaurs from their true perspective, as the Bible indicates.

The Bible tells us that the land animals were made on the sixth day of creation. Dinosaurs are land animals. Therefore, dinosaurs were made on the sixth day of creation.

We can conclude that by simple syllogism. And so that means that dinosaurs lived at the same time as people because people were also made on the sixth day. And that goes against what most people are taught in schools because they're taught, well, dinosaurs lived millions of years ago.

But the fact is we find scientific evidence that dinosaurs lived with people in the form of cave paintings of dinosaurs and petroglyphs and even on pottery and things like that, you'll find paintings of dragons, which are, I think, just maybe deviations from dinosaurs. In fact, we even find evidence of dinosaur soft tissue in fossils. You dissolve away the outer portions of it, and you find that there's even evidence of dinosaur red blood cells in certain T. rex fossils and others.

Soft tissue that cannot last millions of years. It shows that dinosaurs really lived recently. And so really when you understand the evidence, it's consistent with creation.

And I think we can use dinosaurs to teach kids the truth that God really did create the way he says he did, and the scientific evidence is consistent with that. In our closing couple minutes, what is coming up for you at ICR, and what can we expect in the future? We're working on some really exciting research projects here at ICR. A colleague of mine is working on a project that shows that the organisms on Earth, the animals and plants and so on, cannot be millions, let alone billions of years old.

It is very powerful. Now, he won't let me spill the beans on the details until it's been properly peer-reviewed, but I'm really excited about that one. We have another project where one of our scientists has shown, you've probably heard that old claim that humans and chimps are 97, 98% genetically similar.

Well, he's refuted that. He's pointed out that it's much less than that. It's about 80%, which we'd expect some similarity because we look similar, we have similar anatomy, so you'd expect some of the genes would be the same.

But that's much less than what evolutionists would expect. Dr. Jay Kiebert and I are working on a project that involves mapping galaxies and showing that the positions of galaxies are consistent with creation. Some exciting stuff going on here.

We're working on a new book, a Creation Basics book, that I think Lehman will just love. I think it'll be just a wonderful introduction to creation, written by basically all the experts here at ICR. It's just an exciting time to be a Christian as we find all these new lines of scientific evidence that confirm what the Bible has taught all along, that God really did create just the way he says he did in six days a few thousand years ago.

Very exciting stuff. And our last closing minute, Jason, I wanted to ask you this because it's been on the news like crazy lately, and I know a lot of Christians have said, I don't know how, where does this fit in? And I saw that you, and I think it was Dr. Hubert, your colleague wrote a little paper on it, on this Higgs boson, this God particle. Basically, the Higgs boson is thought to be the particle or the particle associated with a field that gives all other particles their mass.

And so they call it the God particle because it controls all others in a sense. Not really the best name for it, but in any case. Is this evidence for or against Christianity or creation? Well, no, not really.

I mean, if anything, it's evidence for the Christian worldview because it was discovered by the scientific method that only the Christian worldview can make sense of. It certainly has nothing to do with the Big Bang. People say, well, this happened during the Big Bang or whatever that was created.

No, no, no, no. We can create this in particle accelerators today, and that's how it's been generated today. But apparently the Higgs field that God has used to give all other particles their mass, so in other words, the reason that electrons have mass and photons, particles of light, do not have mass is because electrons interact with the Higgs field and photons do not.

And so the degree to which a particle interacts with its Higgs field will determine its mass. If it interacts more, it's got more mass. If it interacts less, it's got less mass.

And so we find patterns like that all throughout nature, and I think that's evidence of design. It's because God upholds the universe in a very consistent and logical fashion that we're able to make discoveries like that. The Higgs boson has absolutely nothing to do with the Big Bang, despite what you may have heard.

It really is just evidence of the way in which God has chosen to uphold the universe today. Yeah, I think the media almost peppers it by saying that, hey, this is responsible for all other things, and then leaves out the part that says that, but without this other thing, we wouldn't even be able to create this thing and be able to understand it. So they kind of leave out, it's almost like they're offering just partial evidence and a lot of assumption.

They really are, and any time a discovery is made like that, and even when people try to use a scientific discovery to discredit Christianity, they're still borrowing Christianity to do it. They're like the guy who's breathing air, making an argument against air. They're using the scientific method, which only makes sense because it only works because God upholds the universe in a consistent fashion, and then they try to argue that God is not upholding the universe.

And so it's an inconsistent type of argument. Also, I've noticed they'll say, oh, you know, we've got these particle accelerators that are producing conditions that happened in the Big Bang, and we made these Higgs bosons. But just because we're able to make those conditions today doesn't mean they've ever happened before.

It doesn't mean the universe was created that way. I mean, we can make Volkswagens today, but that doesn't mean the universe was created with the collision of Volkswagens. Just the fact that we can do something today doesn't mean it's ever happened before, right? So really, what all this is, is it's a vindication of the standard model of particle physics.

It shows that we're on the right track in terms of understanding how God upholds the universe today. It's really exciting stuff. If anything, it's a confirmation of the Christian worldview.

It's certainly not anything against creation. Yeah, when I hear the media do something like that, like they throw it out there, this is the missing link. This answers how there wasn't a God behind the universe.

I'm like, oh, that's just spin. You know, they're just spinning it. It really is.

Yeah, it really is. Well, thank you, Dr. Lisle. Again, listeners, please go to icr.org, icr.org. Lots of great materials and resources for your church, for your small group, for you to read, for you to pass on to friends.

It can give you a really great biblical foundation for your faith and a lot of truth by scientists and experts in various fields. So continue to read your scriptures today. Continue to know that God's behind the universe and the design.

And thank you, Dr. Lisle, for being available these past two days on Mark & Friends. Well, thank you very much for having me on. I really appreciate it.

Well, listening friend, what a fascinating conversation to revisit after 14 years. And while scientific discoveries, research, and the conversations taking place in our culture continue to develop, one thing remains especially important for every follower of Jesus. We need to know God's Word, grow in our understanding, and be prepared to explain the hope we have in Christ.

And let's remember those words from 1 Peter, do so with gentleness and respect. You've been listening to a special two-day archive presentation featuring astrophysicist Dr. Jason Lisle, along with Pastor Jason Schiffo and me, originally recorded in July of 2012. For additional information about the Institute for Creation Research, visit icr.org. And if you'd like to hear either broadcast again, read the transcript, review the scriptures, or explore additional resources and points of application, visit GreatNewsRadio.org or WLUJ.org and click on the Mark & Friends tab.

Thanks for listening. Thanks for being a part of our radio listening family. This is Mark Burns with the Ministry of Great News Media.

God bless you, and have a great day and night.