

鳥取大学

平成 19 年度入学者選抜学力検査問題(前期日程)

外国語

英語 I・英語 II リーディング・ライティング

(注 意)

1. 問題冊子は指示があるまで開かないこと。
2. 問題冊子は 9 ページ，解答用紙は 2 枚である。
指示があってから確認すること。
3. 解答はすべて解答用紙の指定のところに記入すること。
4. 解答用紙を持ち帰ってはならないが，問題冊子は必ず持ち帰ること。

I 次の英文を読んで設問に答えよ。

There are some aspects of globalization that most people will agree are good and some that most people will agree are bad. An example of the former would be the spread of medical technology. An example of the latter would be the increased global trade in illegal drugs. Events during the war in Afghanistan in 2001-2002 revealed the dramatic contrast between friends and foes of globalization. Due to the Taliban's* rejection of many aspects of Western culture, some Afghans* apparently buried their televisions and VCRs* in their backyards. When Kabul* was captured by U.S.-supported armies, it was reported that one Afghani anxiously retrieved his TV and VCR in order to view his copy of the film *Titanic*. Judging whether or not globalization is good, however, is complex.

We can identify three main areas that are affected by globalization — politics, economics and culture. Each of these has aspects which can be considered positive and negative. A key aspect of political globalization is the weakened ability of the state to control both what crosses its borders and what goes on inside them. In other words, globalization can reduce the state's sovereignty (the state's ability to govern matters within its borders). This⁽¹⁾ can be viewed as good, because undemocratic governments are finding it increasingly difficult to control the flow of information to and from outside democracy groups. E-mail and the Internet are two examples of technology that have weakened state sovereignty. But decreased state sovereignty also means that the state has difficulty controlling the entry of illegal drugs and unwanted immigrants, including terrorists.

In the area of economics, increased globalization has given consumers more choice. Also, multinational corporations are creating jobs in poor areas where people never before had such opportunities. Some critics, however, argue that⁽²⁾ increased foreign investment and trade benefit only a small group of wealthy

individuals and that, as a result, the gap between rich and poor grows both within and between countries. These critics point out that the combined wealth of the fifteen richest people in the world is more than the gross domestic product (GDP)* of southern Africa. Related to this is the argument that many factory jobs are moving from the richer developed nations to the poor countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia.

At the cultural level, those who view increased cultural contact as positive say that it gives people more opportunities to learn about ⁽³⁾ (and purchase goods from) other cultures. But critics of cultural globalization see things differently. Samuel Huntington has argued that the shrinking world will bring a “clash of civilizations.” In this scenario, clashes will occur among many civilizations, including the Christian countries in the West against Islam. Other critics of cultural globalization argue that the wealthy countries are guilty of cultural imperialism — that their billion-dollar advertising budgets are destroying the cultures of non-Western areas, as illustrated by the aggressive sales strategy of some cosmetics corporations in the Amazon region. The fear of cultural imperialism is certainly a key component in the strong negative feelings of some Arabs towards the United States. Other critics are increasingly fearful that more and more national languages will disappear as foreign languages, especially English, penetrate borders.

The degree to which cultural values can be “exported” is the subject of some debate, according to Huntington. He argues that drinking Coca-Cola does not ⁽⁴⁾ make Russians think like Americans any more than eating sushi makes Americans think like Japanese. “Throughout human history,” he says, “fashions and material goods have spread from one society to another without significantly altering the basic culture of the recipient society.” Similarly, others argue that globalization brings only superficial change. As one scholar has noted, “McDonald’s hamburger restaurants may be in nearly every country, but in Germany they sell beer, while in Japan they serve *teriyaki* burgers. In some

countries, such as India, hamburgers are not even on the McDonald's menu.” Thus the global product is often altered to take on a local flavor. The term “glocalization” has combined the words “global” and “local” to describe such hybrid products.

Is globalization improving human capacity to deal with global issues? Or is it making it more difficult? It is up to each one of us to make our own decisions about this. Of course, each individual's perspective will be influenced by whether he or she evaluates these issues based on self-interest, national interest, a religious view or a global humanitarian viewpoint. For example, how can we evaluate a moral question such as, “Is free trade good or bad?” Those concerned first and foremost with self-interest will ask, “How does free trade affect me?” A national point of view will consider one's country and the effects of free trade on it. If people identify with a religion, they will ask how their religion would instruct them on this question. Finally, the global humanitarian view would ask, “What is best for humanity in general?” Therefore, people must ask themselves which viewpoint is most important to them when evaluating globalization.

出典：Michael T. Snarr & D. Neil Snarr (Eds.), *Introducing Global Issues*

(Lynne Rienner, 2005, 3 版). 一部を変更している。

*Taliban タリバン (アフガニスタンの原理主義武装集団)

*Afghani アフガニスタン人

*VCR ビデオカセットレコーダ

*Kabul カブール (アフガニスタンの首都)

*gross domestic product (GDP) 国内総生産

問 1 下線部(1)の指す内容を日本語で説明せよ。

問 2 下線部(2)を和訳せよ。

問 3 下線部(3)が引き起こす問題点を、本文中から2つ具体的に日本語であげよ。

問 4 下線部(4)を和訳せよ。

問 5 次の1から8のなかで、本文の内容と合っているものを3つ選び、番号で答えよ。

1. 大多数の人がグローバリゼーション(globalization)に賛成している。
2. グローバリゼーションに反対するあるアフガニスタン人は、映画「タイタニック」を見るために、埋めておいたテレビとビデオカセットレコーダを掘り出した。
3. 電子メールやインターネットの普及で、国は国家間の情報の流れを管理しやすくなった。
4. グローバリゼーションの結果、多国籍企業は貧しい地域の人々に新たな雇用の機会を提供している。
5. ハンティントンによれば、国際的な交流によって外国の新しい流行や物が入っても、その国独自の文化が本質的に変化することはない。
6. 本文の著者は、グローバリゼーションの結果、地球規模の諸問題を扱う人間の能力は高まってきていると主張している。
7. グローカリゼーション(glocalization)とは、ある国の物や製品がそのまま別の国に導入され、受け入れられることを意味する。
8. 本文の著者によれば、私たちが地球規模の諸問題を考える際の主要な観点は4つある。

II 次の英文を読んで設問に答えよ。

Standing alone in a small enclosed space, a 21-year old elephant named Billy seems unaware of the two dozen schoolchildren who press against a chain fence to get a closer look. He moves his massive head up and down and transfers his considerable weight from one side to the other. His trunk stretches toward the blue plastic tube that has been provided for him to play with. Occasionally Billy walks slowly over to another part of the yard — his massive gray body, wrinkled skin and big, fanlike ears a little bit frightening yet at the same time attractive. Some of the kids have never been this close to a real, live elephant, and their shouts and laughter convey their feelings: he's (A) !

But to animal-rights activists, animal-behavior experts and even some zoo officials, Billy's situation is very uncool. In the wild, elephants wander as much as 48 km a day, eating leaves and plants, bathing in water holes and interacting socially with other elephants in groups of up to 20. At the Los Angeles Zoo, Billy has had very little space in which to wander. After a \$39 million improvement scheduled for completion in 2009, he will share 1.5 hectares* with two companions.

That's (B) by today's standards, but critics say it's still too little to give an elephant adequate exercise. Living in such narrow enclosed spaces, elephants are likely to suffer from diseases, foot problems and even premature death. Billy's head nodding, they contend, is typical of elephants in distress and probably results from an inadequate physical environment. "I've come to the conclusion after many years that it is simply not (C) for zoos to meet the needs of elephants," asserts David Hancocks, a zoo consultant and former director of the Woodland Park Zoo in Seattle.

He's not alone. Over the past five years, major zoos across America have quietly made the decision to stop exhibiting elephants altogether, some as soon as they can find homes for the animals and others after the deaths of the ones

they have. For zookeepers, it's a continuation of a reform movement that began a generation ago and swept through most major U.S. zoos. The old inhumane concrete-and-steel cages that resembled (D) for animals are mostly gone. In fact, the cages themselves are mostly gone. The barriers between people and animals today consist largely of low walls that give the exhibits the feel of miniature wild habitats.

But the reform movement, say critics, didn't go far enough, and those natural-looking habitats are just an illusion created to improve the visitor's experience. "From the animals' point of view," says Hancocks, "they are not better than they were when they were in cages. It's all done for appearances."

Hancocks goes further than most zoo professionals would, but there is
(1) growing agreement that zoos are on the verge of yet another wave of transformation. This time the question is whether some animals — not just elephants but also giraffes*, bears and others — belong in zoos at all. "On the one hand," says Ron Kagan, director of the Detroit Zoological Society, "people want to see the popular animals like elephants, gorillas and giraffes. But we believe that the American public wants us to create facilities for these animals only if we can provide them with a good life." It was that calculation that last year led Kagan to eliminate an elephant exhibit on humane grounds.

Many animal-behavior experts also oppose confining in zoos such species as giraffes, gazelles* and other animals designed by evolution to run freely across stretches of open plain. "What you see in zoos is just completely unnatural," says Marc Bekoff, an animal-behavior expert at the University of Colorado. But most of all, Bekoff and his colleagues oppose the constraints imposed on elephants. "The only place I have seen truly happy elephants in the U.S.," says Hancocks, "is in the two elephant (E) in Tennessee and California. Once you've seen how wonderful their lives are there, you realize whatever zoos do is doomed to be inadequate."

What's Hancocks' solution? A few national zoos in appropriate climates that

tourists from all over the country can visit. “There are two Disney parks,” he says. “That’s enough for American children. Similarly, two really good spots for elephants in the country would be sufficient.”

A model for what such a spot might look like—and one that animal-behavior experts routinely cite with approval—is the zoo in Oakland, California where four elephants live on almost 2.5 hectares. “Our philosophy is to just let the elephants be elephants as much as possible,”⁽²⁾ says director Joel Parrott. “That means giving them space, not dominating them, and working with them in ways that do not use physical discipline.” The animals spend their days socializing, taking dust baths, swimming, eating and rolling in the mud.

Like Parrott, Andy Baker, vice president for animal programs at the Philadelphia Zoo, does not accept the idea that elephants can’t be housed humanely—only that his facility doesn’t have the money to do so. “I think there’s still a huge amount we don’t know about what animals need and want,” he says. “Could we reach the point someday where we as a community say, we don’t think this is a good species to keep in a zoo environment?” That option is always open. But given the pleasure zoos provide—especially for those kids pressed up against the chain fence—it’s not one to be taken lightly.

出典：TIME, June 19, 2006. 抜粋の上，一部を変更している。

*hectare ヘクタール

*giraffe キリン

*gazelle ガゼル（アフリカ・西アジア産の小型で優美なウシ科の哺乳動物）

問 1 空欄(A)～(E)に入る最も適切な語をそれぞれ一つずつ下から選び、番号で答えよ。ただし、以下の選択肢の中には、空欄に当てはまらない語も含まれている。

1. generous
2. sad
3. hunters
4. opportunities
5. cool
6. decreasing
7. prisons
8. historical
9. sanctuaries
10. possible

問 2 下線部(1)を和訳せよ。

問 3 下線部(2)は具体的にはどのようなことを意味しているのか。日本語で説明せよ。

問 4 本文のテーマとして最もふさわしいものを以下から一つ選び、番号で答えよ。

1. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園で研究されているのか。
2. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園の方が生活しやすいのか。
3. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園で病気にかかりやすいのか。
4. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園で飼育されるべきではないのか。
5. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園で人が近づくのをいやがるのか。
6. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園で子どもたちに人気があるのか。
7. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園で狭い檻(オリ)の方が落ち着くのか。
8. なぜ象などの一部の動物は動物園にとって経済的な負担になりやすいのか。

Ⅲ 下線部を英訳せよ。

問 1

人間は、自分を見て話してほしいと本能的に思っています。会話中に相手を見ないのは、言葉は出しているが無視しているのと同じです。⁽¹⁾視線には、言葉を相手に運ぶ働きがあります。会話は相手をしっかり見て話しましょう。しかしずっと目を見つめ続けては、プレッシャーがかかります。視線は口の周辺に合わせます。そして目を合わせるのは、話の一段落ごと程度にしましょう。また確認するときは、必ず目を見ます。お互いに確認したという意味がより強くなります。

会話中の相手の顔は、あなたの表情の鏡です。あなたが微笑んでいれば、相手⁽²⁾も微笑み、こわばれば、相手もこわばります。相手の表情で、自分の微笑み度を推しはかり、にこやかな対応を心掛けましょう。

出典：小林作都子『そのバイト語はやめなさい』(日本経済新聞社，2004年)

問 2

研究している教師は子どもたちと同じ世界にいます。研究をせず、子どもと同じ世界にいない教師は、まず「先生」としては失格だと思います。子どもと同じ世界にいたければ、精神修養なんかではとてもだめで、自分が研究しつづけていなければなりません。研究の苦しみと喜びを身をもって知り、味わっている人は、いくつになっても青年であり、子どもの友であると思います。それを失ってしまったらもうだめです。大事なことは、研究をされていて、勉強の苦しみと喜びをひしひしと、日に日に感じていること、そして、伸びたい希望が胸にあふれていることです。私は、これこそ教師の資格だと思います。

出典：大村はま『教えるということ』(筑摩書房，1996年)