

本試卷為東華大學族群關係與文化學系 104 學年度第一學期博士資格考之「文化理論」科目，共三頁。應考生禁止討論、抄襲（含網路資料），並應沿用學術論文格式書寫，正確書目引用，避免錯別字。應考時間為 2015 年 11 月 16 日星期一中午 12 點至 11 月 19 日星期四中午 12 點。紙本以雷射列印方式繳交系辦，不接受遲交。

請運用本課程所學內容，就以下三個題目任選兩題，作為答題理論基礎，並提出個人論點和反思。（每題正文不含參考書目之回答字數為中文 6,000-8,000 字或英文 4,000-6,000 字）

## QUESTION 1

Foucault, in the preface to *Madness and Civilization* writes (1967:xi):

We have yet to write the history of that other form of madness, by which men, in an act of sovereign reason, confine their neighbors, and communicate and recognize each other through the merciless language of non-madness; to define the moment of this conspiracy before it was permanently established in the realm of truth, before it was revived by the lyricism of protest.

For Foucault, the notion of “non-madness” defines what it means to be a normal human being, and thus “the realm of truth.” Unlike earlier structuralist approaches, the notion of “power” is central to Foucault’s approach. Not only does the ability to define “non-madness” require power, but the new form of truth itself generates new forms of power. In your answer first compare and contrast this notion of truth with that of earlier structuralist thinkers (like Levi-Strauss) and later action-oriented theorists (like Ortner and Bourdieu). Then, second, talk about the ways in which a “realm of truth” has been created by the study of indigenous peoples (in Taiwan or elsewhere).

## QUESTION 2

Vincent Crapanzano 在“Hermes’ Dilemma”一文中（in *Writing Culture*, 1986:51-76）以為，Clifford Geertz 的峇里島鬥雞論文（1973）並沒有提供「在地者觀點的在地理解」，而是一種「被建構出來的在地者的被建構觀點的被建構理解」（p74）。請依循 Crapanzano 的觀點，闡釋這種「建構的建構的建構」的「詮釋技藝」（interpretive virtuosity, p53），如何使得 Geertz（至少在〈深度遊戲〉這篇文章中）建立起他的「民族誌權威」？同時，這種民族誌修辭設計（rhetorical projection）使其讀者（以及民族誌作者自身）確信他們在民族誌權威的位置，你認為是否必要？是否有其他形式（e.g., James Clifford 1988, Chapter one）？

In his “Hermes’ Dilemma” article (in *Writing Culture*, 1986:51-76), Vincent Crapanzano criticizes Clifford Geertz on his Balinese cocking fighting essay (1973) that “Despite his phenomenological-hermeneutical pretentions, there is in fact in ‘Deep Play’ no understanding of the native from the native’s point of view. There is only the constructed understanding of the constructed native’s constructed point of view” (1986:74). Following Crapanzano (1986), please illuminate how does Geertz acquire his ethnographic authority (at least in “Deep Play”) through such “construction of construction of construction” (p74) in terms of “interpretive virtuosity” (p53). Is this rhetorical projection necessary for ethnographers in order to convince their readers (and themselves) on ethnographic authority? Any other way to acquire it (e.g., James Clifford 1988, Chapter one)?

### QUESTION 3

Anna Tsing 近來試圖用「規模」(scale)的觀點重新思考全球現代性的形成，發展在地知識與資本主義之間「有生產性的摩擦」(productive friction)，並與全球接軌的過程。同時她也對 Arjun Appadurai 的全球地景觀點進行批評 (c.f. “Global Situation,” Tsing 2000)。她提出的替代觀點是「規模製作」(scale-making)：

Rather than assume we know exactly what global capitalism is, even before it arrives, we need to find out how it operates in friction. Instead of rushing toward global spatial compression, I examine the links between heterogeneous projects of space and scale making, as these both enable capitalist proliferation and embroil it in moments of chaos. In tracing the connections through which entrepreneurship operates, the cultural work of encounter emerges as formative.” (*Friction*, 2005:12)

Tsing 認為「規模」取向可以展現資本主義計畫中的異質空間（相較於 Appadurai 的地景論述），得此對比全球與地方差距下資本作用的多樣性。請引用 Tsing 的「規模」觀點，說明如何不同於 Appadurai 的地景概念，如何藉由此觀點對全球與地方的二元性加以拆解，並且討論 Tsing 與 Appadurai 論述著重處理後殖民全球化情境（postcolonial globality）的哪些問題？

(Anna Tsing 的“Global Situation”論文連結 <https://goo.gl/E8ZSoQ>)

Anna Tsing uses the concept of “scale” in rethinking the formation of modern globalism. She considers that the “productive friction” between local practice and global capital is the process of making global connection. Tsing criticizes Appadurai’s “scape-making” in the imagined globalism (cf. “Global Situation,” Tsing 2000); in turn, she uses “scale-making” to make further explanation,

(See above quotation.)

The notion of “scale” can demonstrate heterogeneous spaces in the project of capitalism, thereby exploring the diversity of globalism and the distance between local and global. Explain how Tsing’s “scale” concept is different from Appadurai’s “scape” model in understanding the dyad of local and global, and what are the emphases in the explanation of “postcolonial globality” by the two theoretical approaches.