一、 時事：用 1 至 2 句中文(每句字數各 20 字以內)，說明以下時事 (出處免譯，一題 5 分)

Legislators turned the floors of the Legislative Yuan into a ground for a rugby-like game without the referee yesterday. Over 120 male legislators pushed, charged, kicked, and exchanged blows, while their female colleagues threw ink boxes, files, glasses and even shoes, in a grandstand melee that lasted close to a half hour. It was a battle over the Central Election Commission.
(May 9, 2007, “Melee breaks out in legislature,” by David Young, The China Post)

二、 翻譯：請將下列新聞評論翻譯為中文 (出處免譯，一題 25 分)

The French turned out en masse on Sunday May 6th to elect Nicolas Sarkozy as their new president, handing him 53% of the vote. Mr Sarkozy's victory was built on a message of change—rupture is his favourite word—that many analysts considered far too risqué for the supposedly conservative French. By sheer drive and political cunning, Mr Sarkozy managed to build up an electoral machine, through the party that Mr Chirac originally founded, and reinvent himself—30 years after entering electoral politics—as a force for change.

The question now is how far Mr Sarkozy will be able to implement some of the controversial reformist elements of his programme. In his election-night speech, he declared that "the French people have chosen change." Among the first reforms that he intends to bring about are labour-market measures: he plans to secure minimum service on public transport during strikes; to break the big five unions' stranglehold on union representation; to change the unemployment-benefit rules to penalise those who refuse two job offers; and to introduce a single job contract with progressive rights.
1. Logically speaking, how does comparative historical analysis work? Basically one tries to establish valid associations of potential causes with the given phenomenon one is trying to explain. There are two main ways to proceed. First, one can try to establish that several cases having in common the phenomenon one is trying to explain also have in common a set of causal factors, although they vary in other ways that might have seemed causally relevant. This approach is what Mill called the “Method of Agreement.” Second, one can contrast the cases in which the phenomenon to be explained and the hypothesized causes are present to other cases in which the phenomenon and the causes are both absent, but which are otherwise as similar as possible to the positive cases. This procedure Mill labeled the “Method of Difference.” Taken alone, it is a more powerful method than the Method of Agreement alone for establishing valid causal associations (provided that one can find suitable negative cases for the required contrasts). In practice, though, it is often possible, and certainly desirable, to combine these two comparative logics. This is done by using at once several positive cases along with suitable negative cases as contrasts.

That will be the approach of this book. France, Russia, and China will serve as three positive cases of successful social revolution, and I shall argue that these cases reveal similar causal patterns despite their many other differences. In addition, I shall invoke negative cases for the purpose of validating various particular parts of the causal argument. In so doing, I shall always construct contrasts that maximize the similarities of the negative case(s) to the positive case(s) in every apparently relevant respect except the causal sequence that the contrast is supposed to validate.

(Theda Skocpol, States and Social Revolutions, pp. 36-37, 1979)

2. The concept of intimate citizenship flags a proliferation of debates about how to live a personal life in a late modern world. Such debates are usually conducted in what has come to be called the public sphere, the domain of civil society in which
people deliberate, discuss, and even argue about life. The public sphere provides space for the day-to-day workings of a deep democracy.

“Intimate citizenship”—as designating public discourses on the personal life—makes for a certain tension: it appears to be an oxymoron. Citizenship usually speaks to the public sphere and intimacy to the private. But this juxtapositioning sensitizes us to the important fact that the public and the private are no longer separate, autonomous spheres, if indeed they ever were.

Unlike earlier versions of citizenship, which often foundered by marginalizing or excluding certain groups, “intimate citizenship” cannot imply one voice, on way or one model. On the contrary, it is a loose term that comes to designate an array of stories and a multiplicity of voices, in which different lives, different communities, and different politics dwell. It must allow for a constant stretching and pulling at boundaries, realizing they can never be fixed even as they must be present. It must embrace the existence of voices of the personal life that are in sharp—sometimes seemingly fatal—conflict. It must fit into the contemporary empirical reality of the ethos of pluralization. It must recognize multiple, hierarchically layered, and contested public sphere such as the feminist public spheres, the black public spheres, the working-class public spheres, and the gay public spheres.


四、英文寫作：請在閱讀完下列文本後，以英文闡釋其義，字數不能超過二百字。（一題 20 分）

The transformation of labour (as living, purposive activity) into capital is, in itself, the result of the exchange between capital and labour, in so far as it gives the capitalist the title of ownership to the product of labour (and command over the same). This transformation is posited only in the production process itself. Thus, the question whether capital is productive or not is absurd. Labour itself is productive only if absorbed into capital, where capital forms the basis of production, and where the capitalist is therefore in command of production.

(Karl Marx: Notebook III, The Chapter on Capital, from Grundrisse)