

東吳大學 103 學年度博士班招生考試試題

第 1 頁，共 2 頁

| | | | |
|----|---------|------|--------|
| 系級 | 政治學系博士班 | 考試時間 | 100 分鐘 |
| 科目 | 專業英文 | 本科總分 | 100 分 |

一、Please translate the following paragraph into Chinese. (25%)

“A bureaucracy is an organization, and its autonomy (or lack of it) is premised on its organizational reputation and networks that support it. When bureaucracies in turn-of-the-century American politics gained a lasting esteem for their ability to provide unique services, author new solutions to troubling national dilemmas, operate with new found efficiency, or offer special protection to the public from economic, social, and even moral hazards, bureaucratic autonomy usually follow. The reputations that autonomous agencies established were diverse. Some agencies became known for their ability to conserve the nation’s natural resources. Others were celebrated for protecting American consumers from the hazards of adulterated food and medicine. Whatever their specific content, organizational reputations had two common traits. First, they were grounded in actual organizational capacity. Agencies with strong reputations possessed greater talent, cohesion, and efficiency than agencies with reputations for weakness, corruption, or malfeasance. Second, organizational reputations were not ethereal but socially rooted. They were grounded in diverse political affiliations maintained by career bureaucratic officials. Reputations that were embedded in multiple networks gave agency officials an independence from politicians, allowing them to build manifold coalitions around their favored programs and innovations.”

—Daniel P. Carpenter, *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputation, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928.*

二、Please read the following digest and write down a few paragraphs of your reflections on the current status of political science(25%):

“Political science is governed by five myths: 1) that it studies politics; 2) that it is scientific; 3) that it is possible to study politics separated off from economics, sociology, psychology and history; 4) that the state in our democratic capitalist society is politically neutral, that is available as a set of institutions and mechanisms to whatever group wins the election; and 5) that political science, as a discipline, advances the cause of democracy.

Paradoxically, most political scientists, whose own work embodies at least some of these myths, would probably agree with a lot of the criticism that is implied in characterizing their beliefs as myths. These colleagues simply act as if they are true, because they don't know what else to do and, in some cases, may be afraid not to. How else understand a poll of 500 political scientists in 1964 that showed that two out of three "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that much scholarship in the discipline is "superficial and trivial", and that concept formation and development is "little more than hair splitting and jargon"? There is no reason to believe that the results today would be any different. There is a deep-going and on-going malaise among political scientists that the self-congratulatory tone of most surveys of our discipline cannot succeed in wishing away. After all, most of us chose this particular subject as graduate students because of a strong interest in politics and with certain big questions to which we hoped to find answers. What happened? Well, we soon learned that political science is not about the real world but only about those features of the world that can be studied by methods deemed to be scientific. We were told—though not necessarily in these words—that if something can't be measured, then that's not it, and if an event didn't happen twice, then it didn't happen. This might be a slight exaggeration, but I don't think it's a caricature. With all the more interesting questions falling outside the bounds of scientific investigation, political science often strikes the new graduate student as an unending war waged against his or her curiosity. And even as the training, with its combination of academic (and economic) rewards and punishments succeeds in bringing another wayward soul into the mainstream, the process takes a heavy human toll. The budding young intellectual, inquisitive and concerned, has become one more social scientist with a bad conscience. Did not the poet, W.H. Auden, implore—in a lecture to Harvard undergraduates, no less—"Thou shalt not sit with statisticians, nor commit a social science"? But, sadly, most of those who I am addressing here did not listen

東吳大學 103 學年度博士班招生考試試題

第 2 頁，共 2 頁

| | | | |
|----|---------|------|--------|
| 系級 | 政治學系博士班 | 考試時間 | 100 分鐘 |
| 科目 | 專業英文 | 本科總分 | 100 分 |

to him. Still, where there is life, there are contradictions, and where there are contradictions, there is...hope.
--Bertell Ollman, NYU

三、Please translate the text below in Chinese and elaborate your comments on the text in English (25%/ 25%)

America's identity problem is unique, but America is not unique in having an identity problem. Debates over national identity are a pervasive characteristics of our time. Almost everywhere people have questioned, reconsidered, and redefined what they have in common and what distinguishes them from other people: Who are we? Where do we belong? The Japanese agonize over whether their location, history, and culture make them Asian or whether their wealth, democracy, and modernity make them Western. Iran has been described as "a nation in search of an identity," South Africa as engaged in "the search for identity" and China in a "quest for national identity," where Taiwan was involved in the "dissolution and reconstruction of national identity." Syria and Brazil are each said to face an "identity crisis," Canada "a continuing identity crisis,"..... , and Russia "a profound identity crisis" reopening the classic nineteenth-century debate between Slavophiles and Westernizers as to whether Russia is a "normal" European country or a distinctly different Eurasian one. In Mexico questions are coming to the force "about Mexico's identity." The people who had identified with different Germanies, democratic and Western European vs. communist and Eastern European, struggle to recreate a common German identity. The inhabitants of the British Isles have become less sure of their British identity and uncertain as to whether they were primarily a European or a North Atlantic people. Crises of national identity have become a global phenomenon.

The identity crises of these and other countries vary in form, substance, and intensity. Undoubtedly each crisis in large part has unique causes. Yet their simultaneous appearance in the United States and so many other countries suggests that common factors are also likely to be at work. The more general causes of these quests and questionings include the emergence of a global economy, tremendous improvements in communications and transportation, rising levels of migration, the global expansion of democracy, and the end of both of the Cold War and of Soviet communism as a viable economic and political system.

Modernization, economic development, urbanization, and globalization have led people to rethink their identities and to redefine them in narrower, more intimate, communal terms. Subnational cultural and regional identities are taking precedence over broader national identities. People identify with those who are most like themselves and with whom they share a perceived common ethnicity, religion, traditions, and myth of common descent and common history.

《Source: Samuel P. Huntington. 2004. Who Are We?: The Challenges to America's National Identity. New York: Simon & Schuster. pp12-13》