

國立中正大學哲學系

九十四學年度碩士班甄試考試複試英文閱讀理解能力

請將以下文章翻譯成中文：

We come back to the total emptiness of almost all the material we are concerned with. These arguments, it will be said, are all very well for serious works of art or for writings of intellectual content, but it is absurd to apply them to everyday, in particular pictorial, pornography. We do not claim that, directly, they do apply. But here we must stress two very fundamental points: first, that what the argument grounds is a general presumption in favour of free expression, and second, that censorship is in its nature a blunt and treacherous instrument. that there is a right to free expression, a presumption in favour of it, and weighty considerations in terms of harms have to be advanced by those who seek to curtail it. Methods of control, moreover, bring their own harms, and can readily involve other violations of rights. Once one has left on one side the suppression of what produces the most immediate and obvious and gross harms, it is quite unrealistic to suppose that institutions of censorship can be guaranteed not to take on a repressive and distorting character, whether simply in the interests of some powerful or influential group or in opposition to new perceptions and ideas. Most of what is in our field of discussion contains no new perception and no idea at all, old or new, and that cannot seriously be disputed. But even if there were a case for suppressing that material, it must never be forgotten that no one has invented, or in our opinion could invent, an instrument which would suppress only that, and could not be turned against something which might reasonably be argued to be of a more creative kind. The Obscene Publications Acts sought to avoid this danger by the 'public good defence', to prevent conviction of material which was creatively valuable. We have already given an account of its sad history; we shall later argue that such a device is misconceived in principle.