

113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

(國立陽明交通大學、國立清華大學、國立中央大學、國立政治大學)

招生入學筆試

類組：文化研究類

考試時間：113年2月2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

Please review the quoted passages below, and begin by offering a concise summary of the translated concepts in Chinese. Subsequently, elucidate the authors' theorizing of the US liberal empire as mediated through the geopolitical, ideological and epistemological formations of Vietnam War and militarization in Asia and the Pacific. Conclude by discussing how this historicized theorization offers valuable insights into the ongoing critical discourse within inter-Asia cultural studies, as per your understanding.

Moving from one U.S. military base to another, Vietnamese refugees witnessed firsthand the reach of the U.S. empire in the Asia-Pacific region. Far from confirming U.S. benevolence, the U.S. evacuation of Vietnamese refugees made visible the legacy of U.S. colonial and military expansion into the Asia Pacific region. The fact that the majority of the first-wave refugees were routed through the Philippines and Guam revealed the layering of U.S. past colonial and ongoing militarization practices on these islands. It was the region's (neo)colonial dependence on the United States that turned the Philippines and Guam, U.S. former and current colonial territories respectively, into the "ideal" receiving centers of the U.S. rescuing project; and it was the enormity of the U.S. military buildup in the Pacific that uniquely equipped U.S. bases there to handle the large-scale refugee rescue operation. As such, U.S. evacuation efforts were not a slap-dash response to an emergency situation that arose in Vietnam in 1975 but rather part and parcel of the long-standing militarized histories and circuits that connected Vietnam, the Philippines, and Guam, dating back to 1898.

The U.S. initial designation of Clark Air Force Base as a refugee staging point was intimately linked to, and a direct outcome of, U.S. colonial subordination and militarization of the Philippines. Soon after, when President Ferdinand Marcos refused to accept any more Vietnamese refugees, U.S. officials moved the premier refugee staging area from the Philippines to Guam. As an unincorporated organized territory of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, Guam—specifically, its U.S. air and naval bases, which took up one-third of the island—became the "logical" transit camps for the processing of evacuees. With total land area of about two hundred square miles, and meager local resources, Guam was hardly an ideal location for the large-scale refugee operation. That it became the major refugee staging point in the Pacific had more to do with the U.S. militarization of Guam than with U.S. humanitarianism. The U.S. decision to designate Guam the primary staging ground for refugees, even when the island's resources were severely stretched and its inhabitants

adversely affected, repeats the long-standing belief that indigenous land is essentially “empty land”—that is, land empty of its Indigenous population. The refugee situation on Guam thus bespeaks the intertwined histories of U.S. settler colonialism and U.S. military colonialism on Guam and its war in Vietnam: It was the militarization of the colonized island and its Indigenous inhabitants that turned Guam into an “ideal” dumping ground for the unwanted Vietnamese refugees, the discarded of U.S. war in Vietnam. At the same time, as Jana Lipman argues, the refugee presence bore witness not only to the tenacity but also to the limits of U.S. empire, critically juxtaposing “the United States’ nineteenth-century imperial project with its failed Cold War objectives in Southeast Asia.”

From Guam, many Vietnamese refugees journeyed to Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, a 125,000-acre amphibious training base on the Southern California coast, in San Diego County. It was here, at a military base, that the largest Vietnamese population outside of Vietnam got its start in the United States. Like Clark and Andersen Air Force Bases, Camp Pendleton emerged out of a history of conquest: It is located in the traditional territory of the Juaneño, Luiseño, and Kumeyaay Tribes, which had been “discovered” by Spanish padres and voyagers who traveled to Southern California in the late eighteenth century, “owned” by unscrupulous Anglo-American settlers for about a century as the California state legislature repeatedly blocked federal ratification of treaties with Native communities, and ultimately “acquired” by the U.S. Marine Corps in 1942 in order to establish a West Coast base for combat training of Marines. Camp Pendleton’s prized land—its varied topography, which combines a breathtakingly beautiful seventeen-mile shoreline and diverse maneuver areas, making it ideal for combat training environment—is thus what Richard Carrico called “stolen land,” an occupied territory like Guam.

The material and ideological conversion of U.S. military bases into a place of refuge—a place that resolves the refugee crisis, promising peace and protection—discursively transformed the United States from violent aggressors in Vietnam to benevolent rescuers of its people. This “makeover” obscures the violent roles that these military bases—these purported places of refuge—played in the Vietnam War, which spurred the refugee exodus in the first place; the construction of military bases as “refuges” also obscures the historical and ongoing settler-colonial occupation of indigenous land, as well as the dispossession and displacement of Indigenous peoples. In the Philippines, from 1965 to 1975, Clark Air Force Base, as the largest overseas U.S. military base in the world, became the major staging base for U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, providing crucial logistical support for the Vietnam War. In Guam, Andersen Air

Force Base played a “legendary” role in the Vietnam War, launching devastating bombing missions over North and South Vietnam for close to a decade. As Robert Rogers documents, Andersen rapidly became the United States’ largest base for B-52 bombers. In 1972, Andersen was the site of the most massive buildup of airpower in history, with more than fifteen thousand crews and over 150 B-52s lining all available flight line space—about five miles long. At its peak, Andersen housed about 165 B-52s.³ The U.S. air war, launched from Guam, decisively disrupted life on the island, underscoring once again the total disregard for the island’s Indigenous inhabitants. Finally, as the Department of Defense’s busiest training installation, California’s Camp Pendleton, the refugees’ first home in the United States, trains more than 40,000 active-duty and 26,000 reserve military personnel each year for combat. Camp Pendleton is also the home base of the illustrious 1st Marine Regiment, whose battalions participated in some of the most ferocious battles of the war. As such, the Pacific military bases, Clark and Andersen Air Force Bases, and California’s Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, credited and valorized for resettling Vietnamese refugees in 1975, were the very ones responsible for inducing the refugee displacement. The massive tonnage of bombs, along with the ground fighting provided by Marine units like the Camp Pendleton’s 1st Marines, displaced some twelve million people in South Vietnam—almost half the country’s total population at the time—from their homes.

The transvaluation of U.S. military and colonial violence into a benevolent act of rescue, liberation, and rehabilitation finds even deeper genealogy in the racialized constitution of U.S. modernity, humanism, and liberalism, all of which continue to shore up what Richard H. Immerman called the “empire for liberty,” or what Oscar V. Campomanes, following William Appleman Williams, in a similar sense called the “anticolonial empire.”⁴ Williams famously characterized the United States’ Open Door Policy since the nineteenth century as “America’s version of the liberal policy of informal empire or free trade imperialism,” which was at the same time driven by “the benevolent American desire to reform the world in its own image.” In other words, the United States developed as a colonizing empire even as it disavowed its histories of colonialism and military take-over through the liberal tenets of freedom, consensus, private property, and self-determination. After the Second World War, the genealogy of liberal empire culminated in the Cold War ascendancy of the United States as a leader of the free world who claimed to have replaced the nineteenth-century colonial order in Asia and the Pacific Islands.

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：(中英文回答皆可)

【A. 批判理論與亞洲現代性】

Translation of the following paragraph from English to Chinese. Please also discuss your understanding of “modernity”.

Not so very long ago one could delight in the curiosities of the world without making any distinction between the information obtained from observing animals and that which the mores of antiquity or the customs of distant lands presented. “Nature was one” and reigned everywhere, distributing equally among humans and nonhumans a multitude of technical skills, ways of life and modes of reasoning. Among the educated at least, the age came to an end a few decades after Montaigne’s death, when nature ceased to be a unifying arrangement of things, however disparate, and became a domain of objects that were subject to autonomous laws that formed a background against which the arbitrariness of human activities could exert its many-faceted fascination. A new cosmology had emerged, a prodigious collective invention that provided an unprecedented framework for the development of scientific thought and that we, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, continue, in a rather offhand way, to protect.

Philippe Descola, *Beyond Nature and Culture*

【B. 性/別研究】

Read the following excerpt from Maria Mies, "Colonization and Housewifization" (*Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labor*, 1986, 1998). 1) Briefly paraphrase what Mies is saying in this excerpt. 2) Explain what Mies mean here by "progress" and "backwardness," how these are dynamically inter-linked. 3) Give an example from your context that is related to what Mies is referring to in this passage; discuss how.

The historical development of the division of labour in general, and the sexual division of labour in particular, was/is not an evolutionary and peaceful process, based on the ever-progressing development of productive forces (mainly technology) and specialization, but a violent one by which first certain categories of men, later certain peoples, were able mainly by virtue of arms and warfare to establish an exploitative relationship between themselves and women, and other peoples and classes. [...] Within such a predatory mode of production, which is intrinsically patriarchal, warfare and conquest become the most 'productive' modes of production. The quick accumulation of material wealth - not based on regular subsistence work in one's own community, but on looting and robbery - facilitates the faster development of technology in those societies which are based on conquest and warfare. This technological development, however, again is not oriented principally towards the satisfaction of subsistence needs of the community as a whole, but towards further warfare, conquest and accumulation. The development of arms and transport technology has been a driving force for technological innovation in all patriarchal societies, but particularly in the modern capitalist European one which has conquered and subjected the whole world since the fifteenth century. The concept of 'progress' which emerged in this particular patriarchal civilization is historically unthinkable without the one-sided development of the technology of warfare and conquest. All subsistence technology (for conservation and production of food, clothes and shelter, etc.) henceforth appears to be 'backward' in comparison to the 'wonders' of the modern technology of warfare and conquest (navigation, the compass, gunpowder, etc.).

【C. 當代思潮與社會運動】

臺灣與海外各界進行交流合作，從文學，電影、音樂、學術、出版業、文創、文化政策、藝術家駐村、工作坊、藝術節到各種層次的展覽會等，隱然構成跨國流動的的文化生產面貌。請選擇你所知道的一或兩項，簡要說明其內容，進而分析與評估其社會影響與效益。

【D.視覺文化】

*Please read the paragraph below and give your interpretation. Please also give examples to elaborate further on the intimate relationship between images and ideologies and how this connection affects our attitude toward certain issues. (You may write in either English or Chinese).

Practices of looking are intimately tied to ideology. The image culture in which we live is an arena of diverse and often conflicting ideologies. Images are elements of contemporary advertising and consumer culture through which assumptions about beauty, desire, glamour, and social value are both constructed and lived. Film, television, and video games are media through which we see reinforced ideological constructions such as the value of romantic love, heterosexuality, nationalism, or traditional concepts of good and evil. Contemporary artists often critique dominant ideologies. The most powerful aspect of ideologies is that they appear to be natural or given, rather than part of a belief system that a culture produces to function in a particular way. Ideologies are thus, like Barthes's concept of myth, connotations that appear to be natural. Visual culture is not just representation of ideologies and power relations. It is integral to their production.

Ideologies permeate the world of entertainment. They also permeate the more mundane realms of life that we do not usually associate with the word *culture*: science, education, medicine, law. All are deeply informed by the ideologies of those social institutions as they intersect with the ideologies of a given culture's religious and cultural realms. Images are used, [...] for the identification and classification of people, as evidence of disease in medicine, and as courtroom evidence.

---Martin Sturken and Lisa Cartwright, *Practices of Looking: an Introduction to Visual Culture* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 37-38.

【E. 媒體與文化治理】

說明：請仔細閱讀下列兩段文字。請用中文或英文摘要說明這兩段文字的重點，並請舉出一個你所知的各類型影像文本（電影、電視、MV、廣告等），來印證這個說法。

Excerpts from “Womanliness as Masquerade” (1929) by JOAN RIVIERE

In his paper on “The early development of female sexuality,” he (Ernest Jones) sketches out a rough scheme of types of female development which he first divides into heterosexual and homosexual, subsequently subdividing the latter homosexual group into two types. He acknowledges the roughly schematic nature of his classification and postulates a number of intermediate types. It is with one of these intermediate types that I am today concerned. In daily life types of men and women are constantly met with who, while mainly heterosexual in their development, plainly display strong features of the other sex. This has been judged to be an expression of the bisexuality inherent in us all; and analysis has shown that what appears as homosexual or heterosexual characteristics, or sexual manifestations, is the end-result of the interplay of conflicts and not necessarily evidence of a radical or fundamental tendency. The difference between homosexual and heterosexual development results from differences in the degree of anxiety, with the corresponding effect this has on development. Ferenczi pointed out a similar reaction in behavior, namely, that homosexual men exaggerate their heterosexuality as a “defence” against their homosexuality. I shall attempt to show that women who wish for masculinity may put on a mask of womanliness to avert anxiety and the retribution feared from men.

[...]

Womanliness therefore could be assumed and worn as a mask, both to hide the possession of masculinity and to avert the reprisals expected if she was found to possess it—much as a thief will turn out his pockets and ask to be searched to prove that he has not the stolen goods. The reader may now ask how I define womanliness or where I draw the line between genuine womanliness and the ‘masquerade’. My suggestion is not, however, that there is any such difference; whether radical or superficial. They are the same thing. The capacity for womanliness was there in this woman—and one might even say it exists in the most completely homosexual woman—but owing to her conflicts it did not represent her main development and was used far more as a device for avoiding anxiety than as a primary mode of sexual enjoyment.