

本試題是否可以使用計算機： 可使用， 不可使用（請命題老師勾選）

1. 請說明下列文字關於民族之起源與構成的論點，並請配合歷史脈絡進行評論。(25%)

Attempts to establish objective criteria for nationhood, or to explain why certain groups have become 'nations' and others not, have often been made, based on single criteria such as language or ethnicity or a combination of criteria such as language, common territory, common history, cultural traits or whatever else ... All such objective definitions have failed, for the obvious reason that, since only some members of the large class of entities which fit such definitions can at any time be described as 'nations', exceptions can always be found...

Like most serious students, I do not regard the 'nation' as a primary nor as an unchanging social entity. It belongs exclusively to a particular, and historically recent, period. It is a social entity only insofar as it relates to a certain kind of modern territorial state, the 'nation-state', and it is pointless to discuss nation and nationality except insofar as both relate to it. Moreover, with Gellner I would stress the element of artifact, invention and social engineering which enters into the making of nations. 'Nations as a natural, God-given way of classifying men, as an inherent ... political destiny, are a myth; nationalism, which sometimes takes pre-existing cultures and turns them into nations, sometimes invents them, and often obliterates pre-existing cultures: that is a reality.' In short, for the purposes of analysis nationalism comes before nations. Nations do not make states and nationalisms but the other way round.

(E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) pp. 5-6, 9-10.)

2. 請依據下列文字，說明並評論英國馬克思主義史家的 *history from below*。(25%)

Closely related to their class-struggle analyses of history, the British Marxist historians have also made important contributions to the development of the historical perspective known as *history from below* or, with specific reference to their writings, *history from the bottom up*. That is, as opposed to a history written from the perspective of the elites or ruling classes – which traditionally has characterized historical studies – the British Marxist historians (particularly Hilton, Hill, Hobsbawm, and Thompson) have taken seriously the historical experiences, actions and struggles of the 'lower classes', recovering the past which was *made* by them but was not *written* by them: Hilton and Hobsbawm on peasants, Hill and Thompson on the 'common people' and Hobsbawm and Thompson on the working class.

(Harvey J. Kaye, *The British Marxist Historians* (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1995), p. 5.)

(背面仍有題目,請繼續作答)

本試題是否可以使用計算機：可使用，不可使用（請命題老師勾選）

3. 武帝即位，舉賢良文學之士前後百數，而仲舒以賢良對策焉。

制曰：朕獲承至尊休德，傳之亡窮，而施之罔極，任大而守重，是以夙夜不皇康寧，永惟萬事之統，猶懼有闕。故廣延四方之豪雋，郡國諸侯公選賢良修絜博習之士，欲聞大道之要，至論之極。今子大夫褒然為舉首，朕甚嘉之。子大夫其精心致思，朕垂聽而問焉。蓋聞五帝三王之道，改制作樂而天下洽和，百王同之。當虞氏之樂莫盛於韶，於周莫盛於勺。聖王已沒，鐘鼓箎絃之聲未衰，而大道微缺，陵夷至康桀紂之行，王道大壞矣。夫五百年之間，守文之君，當塗之士，欲則先王之法以戴翼其世者甚，然猶不能反，日以仆滅，至後王而後止，豈其所持操或諄繆而失其統與？固天降命不可復反，必推之於大衰而後息與？烏虜！凡所為屑屑，夙興夜寐，務法上古者，又將無補與？三代受命，其符安在？災異之變，何緣而起？性命之情，或夭或壽，或仁或鄙，習聞其號，未燭厥理。伊欲風流而令行，刑輕而姦改，百姓和樂，政事宜昭，何脩何飭而膏露降，百穀登，德潤四海，澤臻中木，三光全，寒暑平，受天之祜，享鬼神之靈，德澤洋溢，施摩方外，延及群生？

子大夫明先聖之業，習俗化之變，終始之序，講聞高誼之日久矣，其明以論朕，科別其條，勿猥勿并，取之於術，慎其所出。乃其不正不直，不忠不極，枉于執事，書之不泄，興于朕躬，毋悼後害，子大夫其盡心，靡有所隱，朕將親覽焉。

（《漢書》卷 56，〈董仲舒傳〉）

問題：

- （一）武帝關心的問題為何？（10分）
- （二）略述武帝提問的背景（如政治發展、學術思想等）。（15分）

4.

吾國人一皆漢族而已，烏有所謂「滿洲人」者哉！凡種族之別：一曰血液，二曰風習，彼所謂滿洲人者，雖往昔有不與漢族通婚之制，然吾所聞見，彼族以漢人為妻妾而生子者甚多，彼族婦人密通漢人，及業妓而事漢人者尤多。江浙駐防，殲於洪楊之手，其招補者多習於彼族遊處之漢人，此其血液混雜之證據也。彼其言語文字，起居行習，早失其從前撲擊之氣，而為北方禪士秀民之所同化，此其風習消滅之證據也。由是而言，則又烏有所謂「滿洲人」者哉！然而滿洲人之名詞，則赫然揭著於吾國，則亦政略上佔有特權之記號焉耳。其特權有三：世襲君主，而又以少數人專行政官之半額，一也；駐防各省，二也；不治實業，而坐食多數人之所生產，三也；其二其三，在今日既為貧弱窮困、男盜女娼媒介，而亦適足為珍癡之符，招怨之的。然自一方面觀之，要不得不謂政略上之特權。世界因果之應，不爽毫髮；諺所謂「種瓜得瓜，種豆得豆」是也。其因之動力在政略上者，其果之反動亦必在政略上，故近日紛紛「仇滿」之論，其政略之爭，而亦種族之事也。

本試題中如有以海思計算者：可適用，不可適用 (請命題老師勾選)

夫吾亦謂最多數之漢族，固無種族之見存也。所謂「生降死不降，老降少不降，男降女不降」者，吾自幼均聞之，而道咸之間刻文集者，尙時存仇滿洲之徵文。粵西三點會以「汨」字爲記號，示滿清無主之義，持之已二百數十年，一洩於洪楊之事，而至今未已。此其種族之見之未泯者也，然洪楊之事，應和之者率出於子女玉帛之嗜好；其所殘害，無所謂滿漢之界；而出死力以抵抗破壞之者，乃實在大多數之漢族，是無足以證其種族之見之薄弱也。且往者昧於進化之理，謂中國人種概由天神感生，同所謂蠻貊獠狄者乃犬羊狼鹿之遺種，不可同群，故種族之見熾焉。自歐化輸入，羣知人爲動物進化之一境，而初無貴種賤種之別，不過進化程度有差池耳。昔者爭種之見宜爲之消釋「而仇」之論反熾於前者，則以近日政治思想之發達，而爲政略上反動之助力也。蓋世界進化，化及多數壓制少數之時期；風潮所趨，決不使少數特種獨留於亞東社會；此其於政略上所以有「仇滿」之論也。雖然，人之神經甚爲複雜，被染於歐化者，亦能盡滌其遺傳性也；是以其動機雖在政略上，而聯想所及，不免自混於昔日種族之見。且適聞西方民族主義之說，而觸其格致古微孔教大同之故習，則以「仇滿」之說附隨之。故雖明揭其並非昔日種族之見而亦不承認也。是吾細剖解之，而見其重心乃全在政略上，何則？果其注重於種族上者，則其術不外兩端：一曰暴動，二曰陰謀。暴動者，如義和團之惡洋人也；不問其爲教士，爲商人，見洋人則殺之。使以此術而讎滿也。則今日之所謂「滿人」者自京師及東三省外，已殄矣無遺矣。陰謀者，如周之於殷，越之於吳。聞敵之治焉而憂，聞其亂焉而喜，遺謀者以間之，貽玩好以惑之。循是而論，則彼李蓮英之惑溺，王文韶、張之洞輩之貽誤；而各省官吏勒索賠款，公行賄賂，以爲彼政府欵怨於平民者，其足以動搖滿人之基本，而爲多數漢族之功臣！如張百熙之流，實心舉行新政者，宜斥爲助桀之民賊而誅之！至於滿洲人中如所謂光緒、肅王、醇王號聖明者，當行間而殺之！而如剛毅、榮祿而惟恐天去其疾，而圖所以保護之！而滿漢之稍有權力者，宜遣辯士說以帝王之業，此皆陰謀之所有事也。要之無滿不仇，無漢不親，事之有利於滿人者，雖善亦惡！而事之有害於滿人者，雖兇亦吉，此則純乎種族之見者也，而今唱讎滿者，其所指揮，所褒貶，一與吾前者云云相反，是非真仇滿者也。

雖然，今之真仇滿者，而有之矣，分爲二黨：甲黨出於少數號爲滿人之中，襲「漢人強，滿人亡」之論，而密圖所以壓制漢人者也。乙黨出於多數漢族之中，欲請行立憲政體，奉今之朝廷爲萬世一系之天皇，而卽滿洲人以爲貴族議院者也。乙黨責章甫以適越，其售否固未可必。甲黨之舉動多類兒戲，其甚者爲禁漢族學陸軍於日本，如曰「教一人，是一人」。是其喚起多數漢人使之重入種族之夢者也。而兩黨相舍之一點，在保守少數人固有之特權，此其仇滿之策之中心點也。世運所趨，亦以殘害少數幸福爲目的者，無成立之理；凡少數特種未有不摧敗者。且今日少數滿人中，間有一二開化者，然以與多數漢族中之開化者相比比例，孰強孰弱，較然易睹。果奉兩黨之策，是樹此少數者以爲衆射之鵠，不使蹈法國貴族之覆轍，不止也。

夫民權之趨勢，若決江河，沛然莫禦。而吾國之官行政界者，猥欲以煙營當之，以招他日慘殺之禍，此固至可憫歎者也。而甲乙兩黨又欲專其禍，以貽少數人之滿洲人，是豈亦仇滿之尤者乎！吾所謂「仇滿」，固不在彼，而在此。

(莊元華，〈論「仇滿」〉，〈莊元華吟集〉)

題意：

- (一) 作於分分時導人「仇滿」的淵由為何？(13分)
- (二) 作於已時「禁學」的辦法又為何？(12分)