D. Fisher
July, 2001
1500 words

FEATURE: *The Wedge of Truth* – Phillip Johnson
真相的一角

PROF.: A lawyer has written books about evolution.

有一位律师写了一本书关于进化论。

VOICE: Why? What does he think he knows, that biologists haven't already told us?

为甚么？连生物学家都还不能告诉我们的，他会知道多少？

PROF.: Let's talk about it.

让我们谈谈吧。

TAPE: THEME AND ANNOUNCEMENT

PROF.: Prof. Dr. Phillip Johnson recently retired from teaching law at the University of California in Berkeley [BERK-lee]. His education in law taught him to be analytical – for example, to evaluate evidence to see whether it proves a person is guilty or not guilty of a crime.

在 加利佛尼亚大学任教法律的教授 Prof. Dr. Phillip Johnson 最近退休了。研读法律令他惯于分析性思考，比如，要证实一个人是否有罪就要衡量所有证据。

VOICE: Isn't he the man who became interested in evaluating evolution during a visit to London? Didn't he examine many of the writings of leading evolutionary scientists, and discover that they didn't provide evidence convincing enough to persuade a court of law?

他是否就是在旅游伦敦后，对评价进化论发生兴趣的那位？难道他没有研究那些权威科学家关于进化论的文章，他们都不能提供足够的证据去说服法庭？

PROF.: That's true. He discovered that many evolutionary writers began by assuming evolution, and ended at the same place they had started.

Dr. Johnson has written several books on the subject of the evidences for and against evolution. Titles include *Darwin on Trial, Reason in the Balance,* and *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds.*[1]

Today we present an interview with Dr. Phillip Johnson about his new book, *The Wedge of Truth*.[2] The interviewer began by asking…

说得对，他也发现很多写进化论的作者，由假设进化论作开始，到结论时还是原地转。Dr. Johnson 曾写过多本着作关于进化论的正反论证，包括《审判达尔文 》、《*Reason in the Balance*》 及 《*Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds*》。今天我们要访问一下Dr. Johnson 关于他的新书《真相的一角》。访问者开始问 …

VOICE: How would you describe the main purpose of *The Wedge of Truth*?

你怎样形容写这本书《真相的一角》 的主要目的？

PROF.: Each of my books builds upon the logic that was erected in my previous ones. My prior books argued that the real discoveries of science – as opposed to the materialist philosophy that has been imposed upon science – point straight towards the reality of intelligent causes in biology.

When you realize that fact, then you are ready to recognize that there are two definitions of "science" in our culture. One definition says that scientists follow the evidence regardless of the philosophy; the other says that scientists must follow the [materialist] philosophy regardless of the evidence. The "Wedge of Truth" is driven between those two definitions, and enables people to recognize that "In the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1) is as true scientifically as it is in every other respect.

---

[1] (Ir these books have not been published in your language, I would suggest giving their titles in English, then restating them in your language).

[2] (A wedge is a piece of metal, shaped like a triangle, that is used to split wooden logs).

From that starting point, I go on to discuss the major scientific and cultural questions that ought to be on the table for discussion. *The Wedge of Truth* is most like my previous book *Reason in the Balance* – but written with the advantage of five more years of reading and discussion.

我的每一本书的逻辑都引发自前一本书，我上一本书正在辩论科学的真正发现，直指生物学的真实智慧，反对将唯物论哲学强加于科学。当你看见到这个论据，你亦会发现在我们的文化中，「科学」是有两个定义。第一个定义是指科学家依据证据而不理任何哲学思想；第二个定义是指科学一定要依据唯物论的哲学而不可只靠证据。而《真相的一角》这书就希望在这两个定义之间，让读者能明白「太初有道」(约 1:1) 的真理不管在那一方面都合乎科学的。从一开始，我要将科学的重点及文化上的问题一并公开讨论，《真相的一角》这书与我前一本书《Reason in the Balance》很相似，但这书更优胜的是多了五年的研究和讨论。

VOICE: In the June 1992 edition of *Scientific American*, Stephen Jay Gould attacked your book *Darwin on Trial* – as well as you personally – by saying that a lawyer, quote, "cannot simply trot out some applicable criteria from his own world and falsely condemn us from a mixture of ignorance and inappropriateness." End quote. How does *The Wedge of Truth* address this criticism?

于 1992年六月出版的《*Scientific American*》, 作者斯蒂芬曾批评你 《审判达尔文》一书甚至你本人, 指称你作为律师不能只在自己法律的知识范围用有关的标准，而错误地指责科学家的无知及不恰当。你在《真相的一角》这书中对此批评如何响应？

PROF.: Biologists deserve respect when they tell us ***what they know as biologists.*** But when biologists presume to tell us what ***philosophical concepts*** we must accept, ***they have stepped far outside of their legitimate expert role.***

At that point outside critics[3] must step in to separate the genuine biology from the philosophical prejudice. What Stephen Jay Gould describes as criteria from the legal world are actually fundamental logical principles that must be applied in all fields of study, including evolutionary science.

当生物学家清楚自己的身份当然值得尊重，但如果他们假设我们要接受一些哲学概念，那么他们则与那合理的专业身份相距太远了。至于生物学以外的批评，应用来分开真正的生物学及哲学偏见。而史蒂芬教授所形容的法律界的标准，其实才是适用在所有学问上的基本思考逻辑，包括进化论科学。

VOICE: Many scientists argue that evolution could simply be the way God chose to create the world. How do you respond?

有些科学家认为进化论只是上帝创造世界的方法，你怎样响应？

PROF.: God could create however he wished to create. But the modern, neo-Darwinistic theory of evolution says that God was limited by naturalistic philosophy, and would not dare to do anything that our current rules of science do not permit. The absence of God is a necessary presupposition of Darwinism. If we assume that God was always there, ready and willing to create, then we would never entertain such an absurd idea as that the peppered-moth experiment tells us something significant about how God actually did create.

上帝当然可以随祂的意思创造世界，但现代新达尔文的进化理论认为被神大自然哲学所限制，根本不会造一些我们现有科学规律所不容许的东西。达尔文主意是预先假设上帝并不存在，假如我们相信上帝存在并且愿意创造，那么我们并不会理会那荒谬的说法

[3] (critics from outside the field of biology).

VOICE: The general public seems willing to believe anything that the “scientific elite” says. Is that simply because they are so impressed with the prestige that enshrouds the halls of academia?

一般人都愿意相信所谓「优越科学」的说法。这是否是单单因为他们对隐盖学术界的声望有很好的印象？

PROF.: There is a deeper issue. Many people deny God because they do not wish to honor the true God. So they turn from the creator to created things, including idols of the mind like the theory of evolution.

这是个更深一层的话题。很多人否认上帝因为他们不想荣耀真的神，因此他们由创造者转向被造物，包括构想出来的偶像就如进化论。

VOICE: How did you enter this debate in the first place?

你如何开始这辩论？

PROF.: As an adult convert to Christ, already an established professor at [the University of California at] Berkeley [BERK-lee], I knew that most intellectuals are either agnostic or very liberal in religion.[4] They assume that a Christian must be somebody who has thrown his brains out the window for some emotional reason. The primary reason they are so confident in that judgment is that they believe science has demonstrated that an unguided natural process is our true creator.

When I was on sabbatical leave in London in 1988, I had time to read the literature of Darwinism and discovered that the theory is founded upon the very same naturalistic assumptions which it supposedly validates.[5]

我是成年后才信主，那时我在 Berkeley 的加利佛尼亚大学任职教授，我明白大部份知识分子对信仰不是很保守就是很自由的。他们以为基督徒一定是由于感性的影

[4] (A "liberal" doesn’ t believe all of the Bible, but believes his mind can decide what is really true).

响而冲昏了头脑。基督徒对这判断如此肯定的主要原因是相信科学已证明了一个无指引性的自然过程便是我们的真正造物者。1988年当我在伦敦休假时，我有机会读到达尔文主意的论文，发现他的理论是基于被认为有效的类似自然假设。

VOICE: In other words, it ***starts*** with the speculation that nature made itself without God, and assumes that that speculation is true. Then it convinces itself that it has proven ***the idea with which it began.***

换句话说，它从推测开始说明自然制造了它本身，并不是被上帝创造的，而且认为这推测是真实的，然后它说服它本身它已经证明了这种观点是非常合理和可靠的。是吗？

PROF.: Yes. I also discovered that the literature of evolutionary science is replete with circular reasoning, hidden assumptions, wild extrapolations, and biased treatment of evidence. I realized that I was dealing not with a true scientific theory but with ***a creation myth backed by pseudoscience.***

I wanted to tell the world what I had learned – and so I wrote *Darwin on Trial* and have gone on from there.

是的。我也发现了进化科学的许多文献都充满了许多循回的理由、被隐含的假设、混乱的推断, 而且对证据存偏见。我意识到，我不是一个以真实的科学理论打交道的人，而是以创世神话背后的伪科学打交道的人。

我想要告诉世界我学了什么 -于是我就写了《审判达尔文》一切就从在那里开始。

VOICE: What are some of the major issues at stake in the debate over naturalism?

在关于对自然主义的争辩中，有些什么主要的危急事项？

---

[5] ("Validates" means confirms or proves).

PROF.: The most important question is whether God is real or imaginary. Did God create man or did man create God? The latter is the teaching of evolutionary naturalism, and even many Christian thinkers tacitly assume that position.

In Chapter Four of *The Wedge of Truth* I ask whether theology has any access to knowledge – as opposed to being mere subjective belief. These are some of the most important intellectual questions of our time and of all time.
最重要的问题在于上帝是真实或想象的. 是上帝创造了人, 还是人创造了上帝? 后者是进化论自然主义的教学, 甚至许多基督徒思想家都错误地假设了的立场.

在《真相的一角》的第四章中, 我问神学是否获取知识的一条通道－就像反对纯粹的主观信仰一样. 这些都是我们这年代以及以前所有的年代中的知识分子所关注的一些最重要的问题.

VOICE: Is debate even being allowed?
这种的辩论方式是被允许的吗?

PROF.: There is fierce resistance. For example, we had a conference at Baylor [BAY-lur] University in April 2000 to discuss whether the evidence of nature points towards or away from the need for a supernatural creator. It was probably the most distinguished conference in Baylor history, with two Nobel Prize winners and many of the country's most distinguished professors in science, philosophy, and history.
有激烈的抵抗. 举例来说, 我们于2000年4月在贝勒大学举行了一次研讨会, 讨论自然证据的性质是否指向或背离了超自然的造物主. 这可能是贝勒历史上最著名的一次会议, 参加者当中有两名是诺贝尔奖得奖者, 还有许多国家最杰出的科学家, 哲学家和历史学家等等.

The conference so frightened the Baylor faculty[6] that they demanded that the sponsoring Institute be shut down at once to make sure that nothing of that kind ever happened again!

这次的会议让贝勒大学感到畏惧, 他们要求主办学院立即关闭以确保没有这种事再发生!

On the issue of naturalism the university world is totally closed-minded and fearful. But the truth will eventually wear them down.

关于这个自然主义的争论，大学世界是完全封闭和畏惧. 并且最终使他们退却的是真相.

VOICE: What has been the response to your work?

你的作品有些什么回应呢?

PROF.: I am very controversial. I attract huge audiences at conservative churches and seminaries, and also at secular universities. Students are fascinated by the topic of origins, and want to hear something more substantial than the propaganda they get in their classes.

我是个非常有争议的人。在保守的教会、神学院并在世俗大学里我吸引大量听众。学生们被‘起源’这题目所迷住，他们想要听一些比他们在课堂里获取的宣传更广泛和实质的信息。

The most peculiar reaction is the hostility which I encounter from many professors. ...This is not because I am unpopular, but because my message is too well received for the comfort level of certain influential professors. I am raising a question that many professors had hoped would be buried forever, and they are extremely embarrassed when students start asking them the tough questions

[6] (the professors).

about evolution and naturalism. But everyone who steps out on behalf of the truth encounters bitter opposition like that, in the church as well as in the secular world.

最特殊的反应是来自许多教授的敌意。…这不是因为我是不得人心的，但由于我的信息达到舒适的水平，在一些有影响力的教授当中获得好评。 我提出一个许多教授都希望永远会被埋没的问题，并且当学生开始询问他们有关进化论和自然主义的难题时，他们非常尴尬。但无论何人只要他代表着人们向真相跨步的话都遇到同样苦涩的反对，无论在教会里或在世俗世界。

VOICE: British professor Dr. Richard Dawkins is quoted as saying that science is not a religion because it, quote, “is free from the main vice of religion, which is faith.” End quote. How would you respond to this?

英国博士教授理查德. 道金斯，引述他的话说,「科学不是宗教, 因为它『没有宗教信仰的主要的罪恶, 是信念』. 你会如何回应? 」

PROF.: Dawkins has faith in metaphysical materialism. Absent that faith,[7] it would be obvious to him – as it is to me – that the Darwinian “blind watchmaker” mechanism has no creative power.

Everybody starts from faith, just as every house has a foundation. The question is not whether you will build upon a foundation, but whether you will build upon a foundation of rock or upon a foundation of sand.

道金斯相信形而上学的唯物主义。 如果他缺少了那份信念，就如同达尔文主义里的“盲人修表匠” 机制一样，明显地对他来说-也正如它对我一样－是没有创造力的。

[7] (If he did not have that faith).

每个人从信心开始，正象每所房子有地基一样。问题不在乎你是否即将安装地基，而是你将地基建在盘石上或是建在沙土上。

TAPE: THEME AND ANNOUNCEMENT

© Copyright 2001 David Ernest Fisher. All rights reserved.

Source:
http://www.christianbook.com/Christian/Books/dpep/interview.pl/16559901?sku=22674