

109學年度台灣聯合大學系統
亞際文化研究國際碩士學位學程
(國立交通大學、國立清華大學、國立中央大學)
招生入學筆試

類組：文化研究類

考試時間：109年2月7日，11:00-12:00

考試說明：共兩題，作答時間一小時。第一題所有考生必考，第二題是四大領域之「專業科目」選考。

I. Required Question 必考題

Read the following excerpt from “Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe” (Verena Stolcke, 1995: 8). 1) Carefully and thoroughly summarize in your words the passage’s definition of “cultural fundamentalism” and how it works. 2) Discuss its relevance in one case or example of your choice.

Instead of ordering different cultures hierarchically, cultural fundamentalism segregates them spatially, each culture in its place. The fact that nation-states are by no means culturally uniform is ignored. Localized political communities are regarded by definition as culturally homogeneous. [...] Their targets are uprooted strangers who fail to assimilate culturally. Being symmetrical, these categories are logically reversible – any national is a foreigner to any other nation in a world of nation-states, for to possess a nationality is in the nature of things. This formal conceptual polarity – nationals as against foreigners – is charged with political meaning. By manipulating the ambiguous link between national belonging and cultural identity, the notion of xenophobia infuses the relationship between the two categories with a specific and substantive political content. Because the propensity to dislike strangers is shared by foreigners, it also becomes legitimate to fear that the latter, by their disloyalty, might threaten the national community. When the "problem" posed by extracommunitarian immigration is conceptualized in terms of self-evident cultural difference and incommensurability, the root causes of immigration, namely, the deepening effects of North-South inequality, are explained away. [...] By building its case for the exclusion of immigrants on a trait shared by all humans alike rather than on an unfitness allegedly intrinsic to extracommunitarians, cultural fundamentalism, by contrast with racist theories, has a certain openness which leaves room for requiring immigrants, if they wish to live in our midst, to assimilate culturally. And because of the other important idea in modern Western political culture, namely, that all humans are equal and free, anti-immigrant rhetoric is polemical and open to challenge, which is why existing forms of exclusion, inequality, and oppression need to be rationalized ideologically. At the core of this ideology of collective exclusion predicated on the idea of the "other" as a foreigner, a stranger, to the body politic is the assumption that formal political equality presupposes cultural identity and hence cultural sameness is the essential prerequisite for access to citizenship rights. [...] The "problem" of immigration is construed, [...] as a political threat to national identity and integrity on account of immigrants' cultural diversity because the nation-state is conceived as founded on a bounded and distinct community which mobilizes a shared sense of belonging

and loyalty predicated on a common language, cultural traditions, and beliefs. In a context of economic recession and national retrenchment, appeals to primordial loyalties fall on fertile ground because of the ordinary taken-for-granted sense of national belonging that is the common idiom of contemporary political self-understanding. [...] In this respect, nationality is not all that different from the kinship principles that operated in so-called primitive societies to define group membership. In the modern world of nation-states, nationality, citizenship, cultural community, and state are conflated ideologically and endow immigrants' cultural distinctiveness with symbolic and political meaning.

II. Specialization Question 主修領域之「專業科目」測驗

請選擇您的主修領域擇一作答：

【A.批判理論與亞洲現代性】

In the face of this pseudo-right, the *right to the city* is like a cry and a demand. This right slowly meanders through the surprising detours of nostalgia and tourism, the return to the heart of the traditional city, and the call of existent or recently developed centralities. ..The right to the city cannot be conceived of as a simple visiting right or as a return to the traditional city. It can only be formulated as a transformed and renewed *right to urban life*. It does not matter whether the urban fabric encloses the countryside and what survived of peasant life, as long as the “urban”, place of encounter, priority of use value, inscription in space of a time promoted to the rank of a supreme resource among all resources, finds its morphological base and its practico-material realization, which presumes an integrated theory of the city and urban society, using the resources of science and art. Only the working class can become the agent, the social carrier or support of this realization. Here again, as a century ago, it denies and contests, by its very existence, the class strategy directed against it. As a hundred years ago, although under new conditions, it gathers the interests of the whole society and firstly of all those who *inhabit*.

--Henri Lefebvre, “Right to the City”

請說明此段話中 Lefebvre 對城市權 (right to the city) 的看法，並討論這個看法在當今高都市化的全球世界裡的新意涵。

[B.性/別研究]

Carefully and closely read the following three paragraphs by Stephanie Coontz (from *Marriage, a History*, 2005, pp. 279-280). 1) Summarize the main point Coontz makes here, that is, rephrase it in your own words, in English or Chinese. Note what examples and counter-examples are used, and what comparison is made to help Coontz make her point. 2) Comment on Coontz's point and explain its logic in relation to recent developments and debates in Taiwan or any other one site (of your choice).

In France and Canada, an individual can establish a legally recognized caregiving or resource-pooling relationship with any other person and receive many legal and financial benefits that used to be reserved for married couples. Two sexual partners can take advantage of this arrangement. So can two sisters, two army buddies, or a celibate priest and his housekeeper. The United States has resisted extending marriage's legal benefits this far. But it has joined the international trend giving children the right to support and recognition from both parents, whether or not they were ever married. Marriage has lost its legal monopoly over the rules organizing people's personal rights and obligations.

[...]

The breakdown of the wall separating marriage from nonmarriage has been described by some legal historians and sociologists as the deinstitutionalization or delegalization of marriage or even, with a French twist, as *demariage*. I like historian Nancy Cott's observation that it is akin to what happened in Europe and America when legislators disestablished their state religion.

With disestablishment, the state no longer conferred a whole set of special rights and privileges on one particular denomination while denying those rights to others. When this happened, religion itself did not disappear. But many different churches and new religious groups proliferated. Similarly, once the state stopped insisting that everyone needed a government-sanctioned marriage license to enjoy the privileges and duties of parenthood or other long-term commitments, other forms of intimate relationships and child-rearing arrangements came out from the underground. And just as people's motives for joining a church changed when there was no longer one official religion, so people began deciding whether or not to marry on a new basis.

[C. 當代思潮與社會運動]

2019 年 12 月初，中國湖北省武漢市出現新型冠狀病毒肺炎（通稱武漢肺炎）的病例，繼而擴散到中國大陸各省，並於 2020 年 1 月中旬開始，陸續在許多國家確診病例，至今疫情仍持續擴大中。請就此事件在海峽兩岸乃至全球所引發的社會行動中選擇一或兩項做為案例，簡要說明其內容，進而分析這項行動所反映的群體心態、文化邏輯，乃至可能產生的社會影響。

[D.視覺文化]

Please read the paragraph below and explain what it means. Please also explain how it may help you think about the role of mass culture in our society. (You may write from the standing point of cinema and media studies, cultural studies, gender and sexuality studies, history of arts, sociology, literary studies, or any academic disciplines within which you were trained).

What especially interests me here is the notion which gained ground during the 19th century that mass culture is somehow associated with woman while real, authentic culture remains the prerogative of men. The tradition of women's exclusion from the realm of "high art" does not of course originate in the 19th century, but it does take on new connotations in the age of the industrial revolution and cultural modernization. Stuart Hall is perfectly right to point out that the hidden subject of the mass culture debate is precisely "the masses"—their political and cultural aspirations, their struggles and their pacification via cultural institutions.⁷ But when the 19th and early 20th centuries conjured up the threat of the masses "rattling at the gate," to quote Hall, and lamented the concomitant decline of culture and civilization (which mass culture was invariably accused of causing), there was yet another hidden subject. In the age of nascent socialism *and* the first major women's movement in Europe, the masses knocking at the gate were also women, knocking at the gate of a male-dominated culture. It is indeed striking to observe how the political, psychological, and aesthetic discourse around the turn of the century consistently and obsessively genders mass culture and the masses as feminine, while high culture, whether traditional or modern, clearly remains the privileged realm of male activities.

--Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*.
