英语四级翻译练习题第009组 PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文
https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/121/2021_2022__E8_8B_B1_E8_AF_AD_E5_9B_9B_E7_c83_121849.htm Do animals have rights? This is how the question is usually put. It sounds like a useful, ground-clearing way to start. (1)Actually, it isnt, because it assumes that there is an agreed account of human rights, which is something the world does not have. On one view of rights, to be sure, it necessarily follows that animals have none. (2)Some philosophers argue that rights exist only within a social contract, as part of an exchange of duties and entitlements. Therefore, animals cannot have rights. The idea of punishing a tiger that kills somebody is absurd. for exactly the same reason, so is the idea that tigers have rights. However, this is only one account, and by no means an uncontested one. It denies rights not only to animals but also to some peoplefor instance, to infants, the mentally incapable and future generations. In addition, it is unclear what force a contract can have for people who never consented to it: how do you reply to somebody who says "I dont like this contract"? The point is this: without agreement on the rights of people, arguing about the rights of animals is fruitless. (3)It leads the discussion to extremes at the outset: it invites you to think that animals should be treated either with the consideration humans extend to other humans, or with no consideration at all. This is a false choice. Better to start with another, more fundamental, question: is the way we treat animals a moral issue at all? Many deny it. (4)Arguing from the view that humans are different from animals in

every relevant respect, extremists of this kind think that animals lie outside the area of moral choice. Any regard for the suffering of animals is seen as a mistakea sentimental displacement of feeling that should properly be directed to other humans. 