

國立高雄大學九十七學年度研究所碩士班招生考試試題

科目：比較政府與政治  
考試時間：100 分鐘

系所：  
政治法律系碩士班政治組  
本科原始成績：100 分

是否使用計算機：否

壹、問答題(共三題，每題得分最高 25 分)

- 一、請問：何謂「新制度主義」(new institutionalism)? 有那些重要的理論或見解?
- 二、請問：法國第五共和或其他民主國家有所謂的「鐘擺效應」(pendulum effect)與「衣尾效應」(coattail effect)，請分別加以分析或說明，並舉實例加以說明。
- 三、請問：何謂「首相的總統化」? 請分析之，並舉實例加以說明。

貳、翻譯(英翻中)

請以 500 至 1000 字左右的限度，清楚地、有系統的說明或分析下列文章的內容摘要。(25 分)

Public speaking skills have long been a chief determinant of whom Americans elect as president. But should they be?

With the *presidential* primary season clomping toward its close, voters readying themselves for the general *election* must ask: Do effective communicators necessarily make effective commanders in chief?

The relationship between oratory and leadership is well-established. From Pericles to Isocrates, Demosthenes to Cicero, citizens have used communication skills as a shorthand indicator of leadership potential. So much so that U.S. *presidential elections* sometimes seem little more than an extended public speaking competition.

But should a candidate's cadence, gestures and emotion-laden storytelling be on par with, say, leadership experience, seasoned judgment and prior testing under fire? Or is rhetorical skill a prerequisite of *presidential* leadership?

"Historically speaking, there seems to be a correlation between those presidents we think of as great communicators and those who are considered successful presidents," says Baylor University speech communication professor Martin J. Medhurst, an expert on *presidential* rhetoric.

'You motivate through emotion'

Indeed, examples abound. Abraham Lincoln guided us through the Civil War. Teddy Roosevelt expanded U.S. influence around the world. Franklin Roosevelt led America through the Great Depression and World War II. John Kennedy inspired a generation to public service. Ronald Reagan won the Cold War. Clearly these weren't America's only great communicators. But as Medhurst notes, "It is easy to see that communication skills are an important part of leadership."

To be sure, exceptions exist. A rhetorically gifted president such as John Quincy Adams, whose nickname was "Old Man Eloquent," turned out to be a disappointing commander in chief. Nevertheless, Adams' post-presidency included 17 years in the House marked by moments of legislative and oratorical brilliance. His anti-slavery arguments would later become the foundation of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

國立高雄大學九十七學年度研究所碩士班招生考試試題

科目：比較政府與政治  
考試時間：100 分鐘

系所：  
政治法律系碩士班政治組  
本科原始成績：100 分

是否使用計算機：否

Even so, in our YouTube-driven digital age, candidates who can motivate voters to tap the touchscreen in their favor possess a clear advantage. As most *presidential* strategists contend, emotion and persuasion are often twinned. "You persuade through reason, but you motivate through emotion," says Dick Wirthlin, Reagan's political strategist and pollster. But as Wirthlin and others are quick to point out, would-be presidents must also explain their policy prescriptions in concrete terms, not mere abstractions.

McCain vs. Clinton vs. Obama

So where do Sens. John McCain, Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton fall on the communication continuum?

McCain's war hero ethos is embedded in his speaking style. Because of the injuries he suffered after his plane went down and the ensuing beatings he received over five years of torture, he cannot raise his arms above shoulder height when gesturing or waving. The result for those who know is one of strength. For those who don't, McCain's podium presence can seem stiff and stilted.

Clinton's technocratic command of policy ripples through her speeches. And in moments such as the now famous "crying episodes," voters have seen flashes of warmth that those closest to her say typifies her private persona. Whether that human touch emerges on the rostrum before the all-important Texas and Ohio primaries remains to be seen.

Much has been written and said about Obama's ubiquitous message of "hope" and oratorical flights of fancy. Critics contend he is a cotton-candy communicator long on saccharin speeches and short on experience. His platform skills are real, but so is McCain's gravitas. The matchup would be one for the ages.

Come November, voters will desire a president whose communication embodies style and substance. The candidate who can fuse the two is hard-wired to win the White House.