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一、請以你（妳）所受過的學術訓練或所累積的思考評論以下節錄文字：

（集體責任）

節錄自漢娜・鄂蘭（Hannah Arendt）, 《責任與判斷》(Responsibility and Judgment),

蔡佩君譯，台北：左岸，2008，页 208-9。請配置五分鐘作答（占五十分）

集體責任的構成必須有兩個條件：我必須為我所不做的事承擔責任；承擔這個責任的個人必須在於，我必須是一個團體（一個集體）的成員，我也是這個團體的作成員，我無法任隨自己的意思而宣布作團體之一份子的身份，亦即這個成員身份完全不像關係，可以按已意取消作關係，有誰要承擔之集團過失，（contributory group fault）的問題必須暫時懸置，因爲任何參與者已非非開始時相同。這種責任總是政治的，不論是老式的，整個群眾為其中一位成員所做的任何事情負責；一個群眾特別要求對其名義為之的事情負責，後者跟我們比較有關係，因為它不論好壞，適用於所有群眾的評，而不只是職政者政府。每個政府都承其前任政府的作局來負擔其負有責任，而每個國家都應承擔其或不負作為負有責任，甚至革命政體也不例外。雖然它可能對於革命政體與其他有關（約定）的關係，拿破崙成為法國統治者時，他說：我會對法蘭西所作過的一切負責，從查理大帝到羅伯斯庇尓和其帝政。換言之，他說，只要我是這個國家的成員，並代表這個政治體，這一切都是以我的名義而做的。在這個意義，我們都要為父親的罪惡負責，如同我受給於祖上功德，對於他們的不當作法，不論從道，我們的責任，我們當然無罪可言，但也不能使他們的作法說成我們的功德。

要擺脫此政治責任，或嚴格而言是集體責任，只能離開這個群眾，但這不過是從一個群眾換到另一個群眾，因為也須負起一種責任，誠然，二十世紀創造出的人，他們是真正的羣眾，不屬於協商所承認的任何社群，他們是難民和無國籍者，這些人事實上是要求對任何事情負政治責任，就政治角度而言，不論其集體或個別角色他們絕對是無罪的，致令他們源於一個外方的地位，可以說是外援於人類整體。如果有所謂的集體之罪，也就是間接之罪，則無罪的狀況是集體無罪，也就是間接無罪，事實上，他們是唯一一群並沒有責任的人；我們通常認定，對於這特別是集體責任，是個負擔，甚至是一種懲罰，但更可以指出，集體無責任(collective nonresponsibility)所能付出的代價是相當高的。

（接下一页）
a passage from Arnold J. Toynbee’s  *A Study of History*

Modern Western Nationalism attacked the Jewish diaspora in the Western world on two flanks simultaneously. It led the Western Jews by its attractiveness at the same time as it drove them by its pressure to invent a nationalism of their own which might be described as a collective form of Westernization, in contrast to the individual form of Westernization associated, for the Jews, with the preceding age of nineteenth-century Liberalism. Like the Westernizing ideal of turning the individual Jew into a Western bourgeois of Jewish religion, the alternative ideal of concentrating the Jewish diaspora, or a part of it, in a parochial Jewish state, with an exclusively and homogeneously Jewish population, was evidence that the emancipation of the western Jewry had been real enough to expose them to the influence of current Western ideals. At the same time, modernism, on the testimony of its founder, Theodor Herzl himself, was also evidence of an anxiety lest the averted individual assimilation should be closed against them again by a Nationalism that, among Western Gentiles, was now following fast on Liberalism’s heels. It is perhaps no accident that Jewish Zionism and German modernism should have arisen successively in the same geographical zone, namely, the German-speaking territories of the pre-1918 Austrian Empire.

Of all the sombre ironies of history, none throws a more sinister light on human nature than the fact that the new-style nationalist Jews, on the threshold of the most appalling of the many persecutions that their race had endured, should at once proceed to demonstrate, at the expense of Palestinian Arabs whose only offence against the Jews was that Palestine was their ancestral home, that the lesson learnt by Zionists from the sufferings which the Nazis had inflicted on Jews was to forbear from committing the crime of which they themselves had been the victims, but to persecute, in their turn, a people weaker than they were. The Israeli Jews did not follow in the Nazis’ footsteps to the extent of exterminating the Palestinian Arabs in concentration camps and gas chambers; but they did dispossess the people of them, to the number of more than half a million, on the lands which they and their fathers had occupied and cultivated for generations, and of the property they were unable to carry with them in their flight, and by they reduced them to destitution as ‘displaced persons.’