

※ 考生請注意：本試題不可使用計算機。請於答案卷(卡)作答，於本試題紙上作答者，不予計分。

以下六題請選四題作答，每題 25 分。

1. 下面一段文章是從Gorge Orwell, 1984 節錄而來，談語言（獨裁者所創造出來的Newspeak新語言）與思想控制。我們當今所面對的政治情勢是獨裁與民主兩大陣營的鬥爭。獨裁者與其體系在世界各地以各種控制語言思想與行動來吞滅民主，也因此很多評論家指出我們必須重讀歐威爾的1984 以便了解當今狀況。請闡釋此文裡思想控制是如何藉語言控制來完成，同時論述如果獨裁者靠著控制語言來控制思想，那我們要如何解放思想與語言。

The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought — that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc— should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words. Its vocabulary was so constructed as to give exact and often very subtle expression to every meaning that a Party member could properly wish to express, while excluding all other meanings and also the possibility of arriving at them by indirect methods. This was done partly by the invention of new words, but chiefly by eliminating undesirable words and by stripping such words as remained of unorthodox meanings, and so far as possible of all secondary meanings whatever. To give a single example. The word *free* still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as 'This dog is free from lice' or 'This field is free from weeds'. It could not be used in its old sense of 'politically free' or 'intellectually free' since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts, and were therefore of necessity nameless. Quite apart from the suppression of definitely heretical words, reduction of vocabulary was regarded as an end in itself, and no word that could be dispensed with was allowed to survive. Newspeak was designed not to extend but to *diminish* the range of thought, and this purpose was indirectly assisted by cutting the choice of words down to a minimum.

2. Mark Fisher 在 “Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?” 中闡釋並定義Capitalist Realism. 請闡釋何謂資本式的現實主義，同時論述你的意見

“It is easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism” captures what I mean by ‘capitalist realism’: the widespread sense that not only is capitalism the only viable political and economic system, but also that it is now impossible even to *imagine* a coherent alternative to it.... The power of capitalist realism derives in part from the way that capitalism subsumes and consumes all of previous history: one effect of its ‘system of equivalence’ which can assign all cultural objects, whether

they are religious iconography, pornography, or Das Capital, a monetary value. ... In the conversion of practices and rituals into merely aesthetic objects, the beliefs of previous cultures are objectively ironized, transformed into *artifacts*. Capitalist realism is therefore not a particular type of realism, it is more like realism in itself. ... Yet this turn from belief to aesthetics, from engagement to spectatorship, is held to be one of the virtues of capitalist realism. ... Badiou has observed:

A brutal state of affairs, profoundly inegalitarian—where all existence is evaluated in terms of money alone—is presented to us as ideal. To justify their conservatism, the partisans of the established order cannot really call it ideal or wonderful. So instead, they have decided to say that all the rest is horrible. Sure, they say, we may not live in a condition of perfect Goodness. But we are lucky that we don't live in a condition of Evil. Our democracy is not perfect. But it's better than the bloody dictatorship....

The 'realism' here is analogous to the deflationary perspective of a depressive who believes that an positive state, any hope, is a dangerous illusion. P.4-5

3. Sara Ahmed 在 *The Cultural Politics of Emotions* 中談恐懼。請詮釋下列節錄的段落並提出你的看法。

“‘Look, a Negro!’ It was an external stimulus that flicked over me as I passed by. I made a tight smile.

‘Look, a Negro!’ It was true. It amused me.

‘Look, a Negro!’ The circle was drawing a bit tighter. I made no secret of my amusement.

‘Mama, see the Negro! I’m frightened! Frightened! Frightened!’ Now they were beginning to be afraid of me. I made up my mind to laugh myself to tears, but laughter had become impossible.” (Fanon 1986:111–12)

What makes us frightened? Who gets afraid of whom? The above encounter shows us that it is not simply a question of some body being afraid of somebody who passes by. On the contrary, the object of fear is over-determined; here, the Negro is the object of a fear that is declared by a white child, but mediated through the memory traces of the black man. The fear announces itself through an ontological statement, a statement a self makes of itself and to itself – ‘I’m frightened.’ Such statements of fear tell the other that they are the ‘cause’ of fear, in a way that is personal: ‘Now they were beginning to be afraid of *me*.’ As such the fear signified through language and by the white body does not simply begin and end there: rather the fear works through and on the bodies of those who are transformed into its subjects, as well as its objects. The black body is drawn tighter; it is not just the smile that becomes tighter, and is eventually impossible, but the black body itself becomes enclosed by the fear, and comes to feel that fear as its own, such that it is felt as an impossible or inhabitable body. In this way, fear does not simply come from

within and then move outwards towards objects and others (the white child who feels afraid of the black man); rather, fear works to secure the relationship between those bodies; it brings them together and moves them apart through the shudders that are felt on the skin, on the surface that surfaces through the encounter. P. 62

And then, the story moves on:

“My body was given back to me sprawled out, distorted, recolored, clad in mourning on that white winter day. The Negro is an animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is mean, the Negro is ugly; look, a nigger, it’s cold, the nigger is shivering, the nigger is shivering because he is cold, the little boy is trembling because he is afraid of the nigger, the nigger is shivering with cold, that cold that goes through your bones, the handsome little boy is trembling because he thinks that the nigger is quivering with rage, the little white boy throws himself into his mother’s arms: Mama, the nigger’s going to eat me up.” (Fanon 1986: 113–14)

The black body is ‘given back’ through fear only insofar as it has been taken, stolen by the very hostility of the white gaze. For the black man, fear is felt as coldness; it makes the body shiver with a cold that moves from the surface into the depths of the body, as a cold ‘that goes through your bones’. Fear envelops the bodies that feel it, as well as constructs such bodies as enveloped, as contained by it, *as if it* comes from outside and moves inward. And yet fear does not bring the bodies together, as a form of shared or fellow feeling. While signs of affect seem to pass between the bodies (the shivering of the Negro becomes the trembling of the little white boy), what passes is not the same affect, and it depends on (mis)reading the other’s feelings. The shivering of the black body is misread as a form of rage, and only then as the ‘ground’ of white fear. In other words, the other is only felt to be fearsome through a misreading, a misreading that is returned by the other through its response of fear, as a fear of the white child’s fear. This is not to say that the fear comes from the white child, as if he was the origin of that fear (or even its author); rather the fear opens up past histories of association (in the very rehearsal of childhood fantasies), which allows the white body to be constructed as apart from the black body in the present. 63

4. 請闡釋下列文章的重點並提出你的看法。

當批判本土主義社會運動 (indigenist social movements) 的後殖民主義和後現代主義在 1980、1990 年代成為主流，德里克將本土主義理論化為政治計劃，希望透過建構另類的過去 (alternative past) 來想像反資本主義、反殖民的未來。這是一種以烏托邦為目標的計劃。...

有鑑於此，我們提出以台語作為本土主義計劃的可能。構思來自於德里克對安德魯·格雷(Andrew Gray)的引用：「本土性(indigenoussness)是人們被征服、殖民以前的原來身份構成的重要面向，他們不被容許按照原來的社會—文化、經濟和政治方式生活。本土運動就是要重新主張這樣的身份。」(Dirlik 2011: 65-66)我們將台語概念化為本土主義計劃，並非將原住民語和客家語排除在外，而是相信聚焦於台語，可建立更具批判性的視野，尤其當中華民國政府繼續打壓台語的發展，而且南部人仍然每天生活在環境災害之中。當原住民和客家人已由國家的多元文化主義計劃透過族群化(ethnicization)收編管理，台語及其使用群體則始終被排斥在體制以外，連自我命名也遭到國家否定。族群化依賴的是歷史敘述，例如原漢衝突、福佬—客家衝突，同時將弱勢語言和文化的消失歸咎於台語群體，以淡化中華民國政權的殖民暴力。作為反資本主義、反殖民政權的計劃，本土主義挑戰的是由國家所管理，以及透過將不同語言群體去歷史化和文化主義化所創造的不同族群概念及其關係，由此挑戰「構成社會和政治關係脈絡的經濟關係系統。」(Dirlik 1996: 21)

我們提議以台語作為本土主義計劃，直接挑戰批判幫助維持遷占者(settler)的當下和未來的後殖民意識型態，並直面中華民國政權的史學殖民主義(historiographical colonialism)，並譴責資本主義的不均衡發展。

首先是本土主義對於批判台灣後殖民常識(postcolonial commonsense)，意即文化混雜性和反本質主義，提出了一套的強而有力的論述。在以恢復台語和建構台灣意識的解殖計劃倡議中，不少本土論作者和台語文運動者建構了屬於他們被殖民前的原真身份並以土地為主要關懷的文化與歷史。而此點正是後殖民理論攻擊本土論的主要論點—他們犯了本質主義的錯誤並因此鞏固延續殖民權力。「本質主義」和「原真過去」的文化主張，正是台語運動所面對的指控。... 德里克認為對「文化原真性」的宣稱，或「原真過去」的重新發現和重置，對「受役於歷史」的人來說是至關重要的。(2000:204)當後殖民主義者斷言所有文化身份的形構都是霸權時，他認為有必要「以權力關係去區分不同的身分形構」。(Dirlik 2000; 2010)本土主義的自我宣稱，應置於其生存脈絡來理解，他們「對身分的宣稱，相當程度繫於對生死存亡的關注，從來不是『比喻性』(metaphorical)的關係，而是有其物質意義。」(Dirlik 2000:211)德里克不像後殖民主義般將一切普遍化，而是首先提問：「他們與權力之間有何關係？」(Dirlik 2000: 205)本土主義作為視角，可以讓我們將受壓迫者的抗爭重新扣連到權力關係的脈絡中進行審視。...

其次，台語作為本土主義是反殖民的政治計劃，它揭示中華民國作為殖民政權的性質，並挑戰其合理性。在主流論述中，中華民國自 1987 年解嚴之後已轉化成民主政體，卻掩飾其作為遷占殖民政權之實。中華民國政權的「民主」法理，依賴的是透過族群化和差異政治運作的多元文化主義論述。這樣的多元文化族群政策卻繼續壓制台語，並將台語群體污名化，這正是中華民國延續殖民的證據。

此外，台語運動的目標在於復育被殖民政權所抹除的語言、文化和歷史。關於前殖民過去的本土建構，如德里克所辯護：

特別是對被邊緣化的人和受壓迫者而言，其歷史已被權力抹除，因此對他們而言，重構過去以讓他們自身在歷史中被看見就是極為重要的事，而被看見的抗爭即預設了歷史的身分。在對抗

否定其自身歷史性的「史學殖民主義」時，捕捉壓迫和反抗的歷史真實是最基本的任務，而要完成此任務則需要不斷地以前殖民的過去(*precolonial past*)作為參照。(2000: 215-216)

就如台語運動音樂人謝銘祐所指：「我一直覺得台語歌和台語這件事情，被台灣很大政治氛圍壓抑著。很多人覺得台語歌很俗，但那個『俗』，都一直記錄著台灣。[...]local 並沒有罪，你不覺得台灣的 local 才是我們真正的生命力嗎，就是怎麼樣我都可以生存著。」(江佩凌 2018) 在復振台語和台灣文化的運動中，謝銘祐要求我們注意中華民國殖民主義如何藉由「低俗性」來抹滅台語文化，而此低俗性則成為台語所承受的罪名。堅持將「低俗性」加諸於台語文化，即為殖民暴力之延續。謝銘祐並不停留於此，他更進一步去追溯台語老歌，挖掘其優雅之處，並展示這樣的優雅是如何被殖民暴力建構為低俗。所謂本土／台語的低俗並不是「罪」，而是值得珍惜和慶賀的，是我們的根、給予我們生命、定義我們是誰的資源。以德里克的話來說，這樣的台語計劃「一直是為當下來抗爭，不能僅是關注過去的遺緒，而且必須直面當下的問題」。(Dirlik 1996: 16) 其目標是處理中華民國的中華性在當下的持續宰制，以挽救以本土為中心的未來。

第三，台語作為本土主義能有效地批判中華民國政權以不均衡發展主義作為圭臬的資本主義計劃，持續性的犧牲南部人的生命來成就北部人的生活。中華民國殖民政權將台灣視為佔領的土地，僅供其榨取和剝削，也因此，宣稱與土地的深厚連結，是台語運動的重要一環。本土作家如葉石濤等所宣稱的台灣文學計劃，強調的正是根植於土地與自然的文學，以及記錄人民如何對抗殖民者入侵以保衛足下的土地。... 台語與土地的根連性，與離地、流動的資本完全相反。土地的根連性已成為了本土／低俗的代名詞，隨時都可為全球／資本而犧牲。以台語為母語的人被轉喻並連結到南部人，成為中華民國資本主義計劃不均衡發展的犧牲者。南部不只為台灣的經濟奇蹟提供廉價勞動力，其土地和環境更是為了建立經濟發展所須的基礎建設而不斷地被摧毀。直至今日，南部人仍是在日常生活中呼吸着致命的被污染的空氣，犧牲著他們的肺部來替北部人和工業發展提供電力。台語作為本土主義，為慢性殺死南部人、破壞其土地的不均衡發展提供有力的批判。因此，它不只是由下而上的文化主張，更是對發展主義帶來的物質不均衡分配進行抗爭。以德里克的話來說，他們正是「以經濟和政治發展之名」的受害者。(Dirlik 2010: 68)

當台語和南部人一再地被犧牲與污名化，其所積累的不滿現已被動員來對抗進步政治。在當下複雜的政治狀況，我們相信有必要將尊嚴還給台語與說台語的人以及讓他們有權力去自我命名。同時，我們更亦急需將台語重申為對抗殖民主義、權力的抵抗語言。只有這樣，我們才能再次啟動以台語推動台灣民主的政治動能。

5. 請闡述傅科對權力的分析，特別是全景監獄所展現的權力觀。以新疆/東突厥斯坦為例子思考評論傅科的權力理論是否還適用，如果不夠，要如何補足其論點?
6. 請以2020年總統大選為例子論述台灣的性別政治。