

考試科目	民族學理論與方法	所(組)別	2171	考試時間	5月1日 星期六	08:20 ~10:00
------	----------	-------	------	------	-------------	-----------------

本卷共回答四題，每題 25 分，請依序答寫，橫直寫均可，不必抄題

- 一、請分析以民族學（人類學）來觀察文化變遷對於族群認同（ethnic identity）所產生的影響時，根基性（primordialism）與建構性（constructivism）因素各自所代表的意義與重要性為何？
- 二、請以實例說明，Marshall Sahlins（1930-2021）的歷史人類學理論，對於民族志的研究方法會產生那些有意義的論述？這些對於處理「時間」的概念會產生何種影響？
- 三、討論「社會正義」的概念及其實踐，往往會涉及族群文化的本質性與族性（ethnicity）所涉及各種層面。請就此來分析以下兩個論述：
 1. Hannah Arendt 就猶太人大屠殺所總結的「平庸的邪惡」（the banality of evil）（12 分）
 2. 目前政府推動的「轉型正義」（13 分）
- 四、面對 2020 年以來，全球 Covid-19 疫情所產生的各種衝擊與相關的持續性效應，你（妳）認為這對於民族學（人類學）的人文關懷取向會產生那些影響？而這種影響及其連帶的研究開展，是否能讓民族學（人類學）的應用性獲得更多的重視和肯定？

考試科目	英文	所(組)別	民族學系(2171)	考試時間	5月1日 星期六	10:20 ~12:00
------	----	-------	------------	------	-------------	-----------------

Read the following chapter excerpt from:

Tsing, A. L. (2015). *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton University Press.

Write a 500-word abstract of the following chapter excerpt. (35 分)

Based on the text selection from Anna Tsing, please write a short essay (5-800 words) to describe the term “alienation”. Use your own examples to illustrate your definition. (30 分)

Describe how your proposed research project will contribute to our collective understanding of social processes (800-1000 words) (35 分)

3

Some Problems with Scale

To listen to and tell a rush of stories is a method. And why not make the strong claim and call it a science, an addition to knowledge? Its research object is contaminated diversity; its unit of analysis is the indeterminate encounter. To learn anything we must revitalize arts of noticing and include ethnography and natural history. But we have a problem with scale. A rush of stories cannot be neatly summed up. Its scales do not nest neatly; they draw attention to interrupting geographies and tempos. These interruptions elicit more stories. This is the rush of stories' power as a science. Yet it is just these interruptions that step out of the bounds of most modern science, which demands the possibility for infinite expansion without changing the research framework. Arts of noticing are considered archaic because they are unable to “scale up” in this way. The ability to make one’s research framework apply to greater scales, without changing the research questions, has become a hallmark of modern knowledge. To have any hope of thinking with mushrooms, we must get outside this expectation. In this spirit, I lead a foray into mushroom forests as “anti-plantations.”

The expectation of scaling up is not limited to science. Progress itself has often been defined by its ability to make projects expand without changing their framing assumptions. This quality is “scalability.” The term is a bit confusing, because it could be interpreted to mean “able to be discussed in terms of scale.” Both scalable and non-scalable projects, however, can be discussed in relation to scale. When Fernand Braudel explained history’s “long durée” or Niels Bohr showed us the quantum atom, these were not projects of scalability, although they each revolutionized thinking about scale. Scalability, in contrast, is the ability of a project to change scales

考試科目	英文	所(組)別	民族學系(2171)	考試時間	5月1日 星期六	10:20 ~12:00
------	----	-------	------------	------	-------------	-----------------

smoothly without any change in project frames. A scalable business, for example, does not change its organization as it expands. This is possible only if business relations are not transformative, changing the business as new relations are added. Similarly, a scalable research project admits only data that already fit the research frame. Scalability requires that project elements be oblivious to the indeterminacies of encounter; that's how they allow smooth expansion. Thus, too, scalability banishes meaningful diversity, that is, diversity that might change things.

Scalability is not an ordinary feature of nature. Making projects scalable takes a lot of work. Even after that work, there will still be interactions between scalable and non-scalable project elements. Yet, despite the contributions of thinkers such as Braudel and Bohr, the connection between scaling up and the advancement of humanity has been so strong that scalable elements receive the lion's share of attention. The non-scalable becomes an impediment. It is time to turn attention to the non-scalable, not only as objects for description but also as incitements to theory.

A theory of non-scalability might begin in the work it takes to create scalability—and the messes it makes. One vantage point might be that early and influential icon for this work: the European colonial plantation. In their sixteenth-and-seventeenth-century sugarcane plantations in Brazil, for example, Portuguese planters stumbled on a formula for smooth expansion. They crafted self-contained, interchangeable project elements, as follows: exterminate local people and plants; prepare now-empty, unclaimed land; and bring in exotic and isolated labor and crops for production. This landscape model of scalability became an inspiration for later industrialization and modernization. The sharp contrast between this model and the matsutake forests that form the subject of this book is a useful platform from which to build a critical distance from scalability.

Consider the elements of the Portuguese sugarcane plantation in colonial Brazil. First, the cane, as Portuguese knew it: Sugarcane was planted by sticking a cane in the ground and waiting for it to sprout. All the plants were clones, and Europeans had no knowledge of how to breed this New Guinea cultigen. The interchangeability of planting stock, undisturbed by reproduction, was a characteristic of European cane. Carried to the New World, it had few interspecies relations. As plants go, it was comparatively self-contained, oblivious to encounter.

Second, cane labor: Portuguese cane-growing came together with their newly gained power to extract enslaved people from Africa. As cane workers in the New World, enslaved Africans had great advantages from growers' perspectives: they had no local social relations and thus no established routes for escape. Like the cane itself, which had no history of either companion species or disease relations in the New World, they were isolated. They were on their way to becoming self-contained, and thus standardizable as abstract labor. Plantations were organized to further alienation for better control. Once central milling operations were started, all operations had to run on the time frame of the mill. Workers had to cut cane as fast as they could, and with full attention, just to avoid injury. Under these conditions, workers did, indeed, become self-contained and

考試科目	英文	所(組)別	民族學系(2171)	考試時間	5月1日 星期六	10:20 ~12:00
------	----	-------	------------	------	-------------	-----------------

interchangeable units. Already considered commodities, they were given jobs made interchangeable by the regularity and coordinated timing engineered into the cane.

Interchangeability in relation to the project frame, for both human work and plant commodities, emerged in these historical experiments. It was a success: Great profits were made in Europe, and most Europeans were too far away to see the effects. The project was, for the first time, scalable—or, more accurately, seemingly scalable.¹ Sugarcane plantations expanded and spread across the warm regions of the world. Their contingent components—cloned planting stock, coerced labor, conquered and thus open land—showed how alienation, interchangeability, and expansion could lead to unprecedented profits. This formula shaped the dreams we have come to call progress and modernity. As Sidney Mintz has argued, sugarcane plantations were the model for factories during industrialization; factories built plantation-style alienation into their plans. The success of expansion through scalability shaped capitalist modernization. By envisioning more and more of the world through the lens of the plantation, investors devised all kinds of new commodities. Eventually, they posited that everything on earth—and beyond—might be scalable, and thus exchangeable at market values. This was utilitarianism, which eventually congealed as modern economics and contributed to forging more scalability—or at least its appearance.

¹ Sugarcane plantations were never as fully scalable as planters wished. Enslaved labor escaped into maroon communities. Imported fungal rots spread with the cane. Scalability is never stable; at best, it takes a huge amount of work.