

注意：考試開始鈴響前，不得翻閱試題，
並不得書寫、畫記、作答。

國立清華大學 115 學年度碩士班考試入學試題

系所班組別：外國語文學系
甲組(外國文學組)

科目代碼：3903

考試科目：文本分析

—作答注意事項—

1. 請核對答案卷(卡)上之准考證號、科目名稱是否正確。
2. 考試開始後，請於作答前先翻閱整份試題，是否有污損或試題印刷不清，得舉手請監試人員處理，但不得要求解釋題意。
3. 考生限在答案卷上標記「由此開始作答」區內作答，且不可書寫姓名、准考證號或與作答無關之其他文字或符號。
4. 答案卷用盡不得要求加頁。
5. 答案卷可用任何書寫工具作答，惟為方便閱卷辨識，請儘量使用藍色或黑色書寫；答案卡限用 2B 鉛筆畫記；如畫記不清(含未依範例畫記)致光學閱讀機無法辨識答案者，其後果一律由考生自行負責。
6. 提早交卷者不可攜出試題，請將試題連同答案卷(卡)交予監考人員，攜出將以違規論處。當節考試結束後試題將置於講台，可自行取回，本試場不負保管責任。
7. 其他應考規則、違規處理及扣分方式，請自行詳閱准考證明上「國立清華大學試場規則及違規處理辦法」，無法因本試題封面作答注意事項中未列明而稱未知悉。

國立清華大學 115 學年度碩士班考試入學試題

系所班組別：外國語文學系碩士班 甲組(外國文學組)

考試科目（代碼）：文本分析（3903）

共 4 頁，第 1 頁

*請在【答案卷】作答

Read the following passage from Kohei Saito's *Slow Down: The Degrowth Manifesto*. Write a summary of approximately 150 words. In your summary, articulate Saito's central argument regarding how capitalism manufactures "artificial scarcity," and explain how he utilizes the historical transition from the "commons" to private land ownership to substantiate this claim. (30%)

Which produces plenty, capitalism or communism? Most people would surely answer capitalism. Capitalism has fostered technological advances previously unseen in human history and brought about a society rich in material objects. This is what most people think, and there's some truth to this view.

But it's not the whole truth. We must interrogate the issue. Doesn't capitalism in fact cause *scarcity*, at least for 99 percent of us? Couldn't we say that the more capitalism advances, the more economic hardship does?

A classic example of how capitalism produces scarcity is land. Looking at places like London and New York, we can see how property values have made even small apartments cost, in some cases, upward of millions of dollars. Rents have climbed to thousands of dollars a month, with some rising as high as tens of thousands a month. These properties are frequently bought and sold not as places to live but as assets for speculation, and as this speculation increases, so does the number of apartments where no one actually lives.

As this process unfolds, longtime residents who can no longer afford rising rents are driven from their homes, some joining the city's unhoused population.... It's extremely difficult even for members of the comparatively affluent middle class to live in Manhattan. They have to work themselves nearly to death just to make rent.... Is this state of affairs one of plenty? For most people, it resembles nothing but scarcity. And indeed, capitalism is a system that ceaselessly produces scarcity.

On the other hand, communism, contrary to popular belief, aims to provide a certain kind of abundance.... Land prices are created artificially. A drop in price does not affect the land's use-value at all. Yet people are willing to work themselves to the bone just to barely afford access to this land. The use-value becomes the entire recompense for the price—the tiniest morsel of "abundance."

To explicate the relationship between the scarcity produced by capitalism and the abundance provided by communism, it's helpful, naturally enough, to turn to Marx. The concept of "primitive accumulation" found in *Capital*'s first volume provides a

國立清華大學 115 學年度碩士班考試入學試題

系所班組別：外國語文學系碩士班 甲組(外國文學組)

考試科目（代碼）：文本分析（3903）

共 4 頁，第 2 頁

*請在【答案卷】作答

particularly interesting insight into the issue.

Generally speaking, “primitive accumulation” refers to the “enclosure” of land that occurred in England between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. It is the process by which farmers were forcibly expelled from farmland that had previously been managed communally.

....

In England, cooperatively managed land came to be called commons. People used these commons as needed to support themselves, gathering fruit, firewood, mushrooms, and the like, as well as using these areas for fishing and hunting game birds.... But such commons cannot coexist with capitalism. If everyone already has what they need to support their lifestyles, commodities won't sell in the marketplace. No one would make purchases if they don't have to. So the commons ended up thoroughly divided via the process of enclosure, converted entirely into exclusionary private property.

The result is what I call “the tragedy of the commodity”.... People were driven from the land where they had made their lives and were deprived of the means to support themselves.... Having lost their livelihoods, many of these former farmers ended up moving into cities, forced to become wage workers....

But things looked different from the perspective of capital. Capitalism is a social arrangement whereby anyone can buy and sell anything freely in the marketplace. These people who'd lost their land and means of survival now had to sell all they had left—their labor power—for money, which they then had to spend in the marketplace to regain their means of survival. This is the process by which a commodity-based economy suddenly advances, as all the conditions are now in place for capitalism to take flight.

國立清華大學 115 學年度碩士班考試入學試題

系所班組別：外國語文學系碩士班 甲組(外國文學組)

考試科目（代碼）：文本分析（3903）

共 4 頁，第 3 頁

*請在【答案卷】作答

Read the excerpt from Ted Chiang's "Why AI Isn't Going to Make Art." Chiang argues that art is fundamentally an act of communication defined by human intention, distinguishing it from the statistical probability of algorithms. Write an essay in which you evaluate the validity of Chiang's argument. You may support, refute, or qualify his claims, but you must explicitly analyze the specific evidence he provides to support your position. To what extent does his definition of intention successfully distinguish between human creation and the outputs of generative AI? (70%)

In 1953, Roald Dahl published "The Great Automatic Grammatizator," a short story about an electrical engineer who secretly desires to be a writer. One day, after completing construction of the world's fastest calculating machine, the engineer realizes that "English grammar is governed by rules that are almost mathematical in their strictness." He constructs a fiction-writing machine that can produce a five-thousand-word short story in thirty seconds; a novel takes fifteen minutes and requires the operator to manipulate handles and foot pedals, as if he were driving a car or playing an organ, to regulate the levels of humor and pathos. The resulting novels are so popular that, within a year, half the fiction published in English is a product of the engineer's invention.

Is there anything about art that makes us think it can't be created by pushing a button, as in Dahl's imagination? Right now, the fiction generated by large language models like ChatGPT is terrible, but one can imagine that such programs might improve in the future. How good could they get? Could they get better than humans at writing fiction—or making paintings or movies—in the same way that calculators are better at addition and subtraction?

Art is notoriously hard to define, and so are the differences between good art and bad art. But let me offer a generalization: art is something that results from making a lot of choices. This might be easiest to explain if we use fiction writing as an example. When you are writing fiction, you are—consciously or unconsciously—making a choice about almost every word you type; to oversimplify, we can imagine that a ten-thousand-word short story requires something on the order of ten thousand choices. When you give a generative-A.I. program a prompt, you are making very few choices; if you supply a hundred-word prompt, you have made on the order of a hundred choices.

國立清華大學 115 學年度碩士班考試入學試題

系所班組別：外國語文學系碩士班 甲組(外國文學組)

考試科目（代碼）：文本分析（3903）

共 4 頁，第 4 頁

*請在【答案卷】作答

If an A.I. generates a ten-thousand-word story based on your prompt, it has to fill in for all of the choices that you are not making. There are various ways it can do this. One is to take an average of the choices that other writers have made, as represented by text found on the Internet; that average is equivalent to the least interesting choices possible, which is why A.I.-generated text is often really bland. Another is to instruct the program to engage in style mimicry, emulating the choices made by a specific writer, which produces a highly derivative story. In neither case is it creating interesting art.

....

Some have claimed that large language models are not laundering the texts they're trained on but, rather, learning from them, in the same way that human writers learn from the books they've read. But a large language model is not a writer; it's not even a user of language. Language is, by definition, a system of communication, and it requires an intention to communicate. Your phone's auto-complete may offer good suggestions or bad ones, but in neither case is it trying to say anything to you or the person you're texting. The fact that ChatGPT can generate coherent sentences invites us to imagine that it understands language in a way that your phone's auto-complete does not, but it has no more intention to communicate.

....

Some individuals have defended large language models by saying that most of what human beings say or write isn't particularly original. That is true, but it's also irrelevant. When someone says "I'm sorry" to you, it doesn't matter that other people have said sorry in the past; it doesn't matter that "I'm sorry" is a string of text that is statistically unremarkable. If someone is being sincere, their apology is valuable and meaningful, even though apologies have previously been uttered. Likewise, when you tell someone that you're happy to see them, you are saying something meaningful, even if it lacks novelty.

Something similar holds true for art. Whether you are creating a novel or a painting or a film, you are engaged in an act of communication between you and your audience. What you create doesn't have to be utterly unlike every prior piece of art in human history to be valuable; the fact that you're the one who is saying it, the fact that it derives from your unique life experience and arrives at a particular moment in the life of whoever is seeing your work, is what makes it new. We are all products of what has come before us, but it's by living our lives in interaction with others that we bring meaning into the world. That is something that an auto-complete algorithm can never do, and don't let anyone tell you otherwise.