

淡江大學八十八學年度碩士班招生考試試題

系別：美研所

科目：英文寫作

本試題共 2 頁

本試題雙面印製

I. Reading Comprehension Questions (50%):

Answer each question with at least one sentence. Avoid excessive copying word for word from the article.

By Ted Galen Carpenter
Special to
THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

Carpenter is vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C.

WASHINGTON — North Korea's launch of a multistage ballistic missile last summer generated interest throughout East Asia in defending against incoming missiles. Who knows where President Kim Jong Il might aim one?

More recently, reports that mainland China was building up missiles across the strait from Taiwan generated still more interest. Japanese officials have already decided to include funds for anti-ballistic missile research in their upcoming defense budget. Yet to be decided in Tokyo is whether they'll spend even more to participate in the deployment

of a U.S.-coordinated missile defense shield. South Korea and Taiwan also have shown some interest in joining such a system.

Given North Korea's unpredictability and longer-term concerns about mainland China, the desire of other East Asian countries to get under an American-sponsored missile defense shield is understandable. But providing such an umbrella is not necessarily in our best interests.

Instead of building a U.S. missile defense system to protect friends and clients in Asia, Washington should simply sell the hardware to friendly countries so they can deploy their own systems. Not only would that make more sense financially, it would reduce the risk of unpleasant diplomatic and strategic side effects. Financially, a policy of getting Japan, South Korea and possibly Taiwan to help

fund a U.S.-controlled missile defense program invites "free riding." The stronger our apparent commitment to such a system, the more likely it is that the other partners will try to saddle American taxpayers with most of the bill. We've run into the free-riding problem again and again with the members of NATO.

Even worse, allowing East Asian allies to hunker down behind a U.S. missile defense shield would perpetuate, and probably make even worse, the already unhealthy security dependence they have on America. South Korea, for example, continues to rely on the United States for key components of its national defense, even though it has a population twice as large as that of North Korea and an economy nearly 30 times greater than the North's.

Despite facing a heavily armed and unpredictable totalitarian neighbor, South Ko-

rea responded to the economic downturn caused by the East Asian financial crisis by reducing its already inadequate defense budget. In the event of war, Seoul envisions a U.S. troop deployment almost as large as its own current active duty force. Japan's long-standing security dependence on the United States is equally striking, and the much-touted new U.S.-Japanese defense guidelines will not change much. In the event of an East Asian conflict that does not involve an attack on Japanese territory, Japan will merely provide nonlethal logistical support (fuel, spare parts and medical supplies) for U.S. troops and allow U.S. forces to use Japanese facilities. The revised defense guidelines do not end Japan's status as Washington's military dependent; they merely allow Japan to be a somewhat more helpful dependent.

The last thing the United States should do is create a new opportunity for security dependence on the part of Japan and South Korea. Yet that is the inevitable effect of shielding them with a U.S.-run missile defense system.

Perhaps the most serious objection to a U.S. regional missile shield is the adverse effect such an initiative would have on America's relations with mainland China. Even if U.S. officials decided to exclude Taiwan from coverage, Beijing would react badly. Mainland Chinese leaders would regard the deployment of a regional missile defense system as an unambiguous signal that the United States intended to adopt a military containment policy against mainland China.

At best, Washington's commitment to such a shield would severely damage Sino-American relations; at worst, it could lead to a Cold War-

style confrontational relationship. Including Taiwan in the system would virtually guarantee the latter scenario. Indeed, that step would entail more than a small risk of an armed conflict with mainland China in the future. True, Beijing officials would hardly be thrilled about a U.S. decision to sell missile defense hardware to its East Asian neighbors — especially if sales to Taiwan were approved. But at least that strategy would not create the impression that the United States was laying the foundation for a regional military alliance directed against mainland China. A U.S.-controlled shield would inevitably create that impression.

Making missile defense hardware available at full cost to friendly governments that believe it is necessary for their security is, therefore, a better option on both financial and strategic grounds.

淡江大學八十八學年度碩士班招生考試試題

系別：美研所

科目：英文寫作

本試題共 2 頁

試題雙面印製

- (1) What is Washington's view of the sale of military hardware to friendly countries?
- (2) What is North Korea's role in the situation discussed in the article?
- (3) What problems might countries face if they depend on U.S. military protection?
- (4) What does the article say about Japan and U.S. military alliance?
- (5) What does the article say about Taiwan?

II. English Composition (50%):

Read the short paragraph below, and write a short well-organized essay, explaining your opinion about the topic of the paragraph, in particular what you think about Hilary Clinton's role in American politics, and the idea of women in politics. Do you think Hilary should enter politics? Do you agree with the author that her husband's reputation could hurt her chances if she runs for election to the Senate?

Many people have been speculating that the "first lady," Hilary Clinton, might decide to run for election to a seat in the Senate after her husband, President Bill Clinton, finishes his current term of office. If she decides to run for office, this would certainly please American feminists – who knows, she might even run for President someday! However, one wonders how her husband's reputation concerning the Lewinsky affair might damage her chances in an election.

◀ 注意背面尚有試題 ▶