

2018年度  
英 語  
(問 題)

< H30120018 >

注 意 事 項

1. 試験開始の指示があるまで、問題冊子および解答用紙には手を触れないこと。
2. 問題は2～11ページに記載されている。試験中に問題冊子の印刷不鮮明、ページの落丁・乱丁および解答用紙の汚損等に気付いた場合は、手を挙げて監督員に知らせること。
3. 解答はすべて、HBの黒鉛筆またはHBのシャープペンシルで記入すること。
4. マーク解答用紙記入上の注意
  - (1) 印刷されている受験番号が、自分の受験番号と一致していることを確認したうえで、試験開始後、解答用紙の氏名欄に氏名を正確に丁寧に記入すること。
  - (2) マーク欄には、はっきりとマークすること。また、訂正する場合は、消しゴムで丁寧に、消し残しがないようによく消すこと（砂消しゴムは使用しないこと）。

マークする時	● 良い	○ 悪い	○ 悪い
マークを消す時	○ 良い	○ 悪い	○ 悪い

5. 解答はすべて所定の解答欄に記入すること。所定欄以外に何かを記入した解答用紙は採点の対象外となる場合がある。
6. 試験終了の指示が出たら、すぐに解答をやめ、筆記用具を置き解答用紙を裏返しにすること。
7. いかなる場合でも、解答用紙は必ず提出すること。
8. 試験終了後、問題冊子は持ち帰ること。

I

次の1～10について、誤った英語表現を含んだ部分がある場合には a～d から誤りを1つ選び、誤りがない場合には e を選んでマーク解答用紙にマークせよ。

1. From time to time<sup>a</sup>, in certain places, one does hear intelligent people lament that they do not “understand” classical music, as if<sup>b</sup> understanding classical music were somehow<sup>c</sup> essential to love it<sup>d</sup>. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
2. The bombing of London by Germany in World War II was a terror attack, in that<sup>a</sup> the goal was not to cripple the British ability to wage war<sup>b</sup>, but to generate a psychological and political atmosphere that might split public<sup>c</sup> from the government and force the government into<sup>d</sup> negotiations. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
3. In the 20th century, Communism, Nazism and Fascism presented powerful challenges to the democratic world not only on the battlefield but also in the realm of<sup>a</sup> ideas, offering<sup>b</sup> models for<sup>c</sup> how societies should be organized that many<sup>d</sup> believed<sup>a</sup> were superior to democracy. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
4. The overriding necessity for American policy in the years to come<sup>a</sup> is a return to the balanced<sup>b</sup>, global strategy that the United States learned<sup>c</sup> the example of ancient Rome and from the Britain of<sup>d</sup> a hundred years ago. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
5. Before the end of Obama’s first year at office<sup>a</sup>, five Norwegian politicians awarded him the Nobel Peace Prize, to<sup>b</sup> the consternation of many who thought<sup>c</sup> that he had not yet done anything to earn it<sup>d</sup>. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
6. Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, said several times of<sup>a</sup> Nietzsche that he had a penetrating knowledge<sup>b</sup> of himself than any other person<sup>c</sup> who ever lived or was ever likely<sup>d</sup> to live. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
7. China’s bid to gradual<sup>a</sup> adjust to slightly<sup>b</sup> lower growth has been helped by a still-robust property market, solid consumption and trade, while<sup>c</sup> industrial output and industrial profits have weakened<sup>d</sup>. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
8. As the storm roared through Florida, thrashing winds tearing<sup>a</sup> down trees and power lines alike<sup>b</sup>, and by Monday afternoon officials said the storm may have cut<sup>c</sup> power to a majority of<sup>d</sup> the state’s 20.6 million residents. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>
9. An explosion sent a scorching cloud<sup>a</sup> of smoke and flames through<sup>b</sup> a London subway car Friday, injuring at least 22 rush-hour commuters and sending<sup>c</sup> people scrambling for safety in which<sup>d</sup> police called a terrorist incident. NO ERROR<sup>e</sup>

10. Since last month more than 140,000 Rohingya Muslims have fled the violence in Burma, carrying with them whatever they can on the perilous journey to Bangladesh and arriving hungry, injured, and afraid, if they arrive at all. NO ERROR

□ 次の英文の空所 1～10 に入るべきもっとも適切なものを a～e の中から 1 つ選び、マーク解答用紙にマークせよ。

“Slowly but surely, English is losing importance,” humorously remarked Jean-Claude Juncker, the president of the European Commission, before 1 to French to deliver a speech on May 5th. Is this true? Not really, and it seems not to have been intended as seriously as easily-offended British headline-writers took it. 2, Mr. Juncker, who is known for going off-script in his speeches, delivered his witty comment in English, and the audience laughed.

In any case, speakers of the language of Shakespeare have little to worry about. The European Union has 24 official languages, three of them considered 3: French, German and English. Eurocrats are polyglots, often able to speak these three languages plus another of their own. Mr. Juncker may be right that in the halls of the EU’s institutions, English will be heard somewhat less after Brexit, 4 to the exodus of a big group of Anglophones. But English is not just British; it is also an official language in Ireland and Malta. More importantly, the three enlargements of the EU since 2004 have decisively shifted the balance in Brussels from French towards English. There is no consensus for going back, 5 changing to German.

6, English is putting down deep roots among ordinary people on the continent. For all of France’s famous linguistic nationalism, 7 that François Hollande, France’s outgoing president, was mocked on *Le Petit Journal*, a French news and entertainment show, for his poor English. Emmanuel Macron, a generation younger, is perfectly fluent. Fully 66% of EU citizens speak another language, a number that is growing steadily. Eurostat, the EU’s statistics agency, does not 8 those figures down by language spoken, but it is easy to infer from languages studied at school. Among students in lower secondary school outside Britain, 97% are studying English. Only 34% are learning French, and 23% German. In primary school 79% of students are already learning English, against just 4% for French. Some countries, like Denmark, begin English in the very first year of school.

A language increases 9 with the number of people able to speak it, so languages that are valuable tend to become more so over time. And language knowledge takes a long time to acquire; societies do not quickly change the languages they speak. The trend of English in Europe began well before the vote for Brexit, and is unlikely to weaken, even gradually. Mr. Juncker might better have said that while Britain, unfortunately, is exiting the EU, 10.

(Adapted from *The Economist*)

※Web公開にあたり、著作権者の要請により出典追記しております。  
© The Economist Newspaper Limited, London (18-19/May/2017)

1.
  - a. translating
  - b. substituting
  - c. turning
  - d. switching
  - e. converting
2.
  - a. After all
  - b. In contrast
  - c. For example
  - d. Before that
  - e. In sum

3.
  - a. "fluent languages"
  - b. "strange languages"
  - c. "traditional languages"
  - d. "dead languages"
  - e. "working languages"
4.
  - a. finally connected
  - b. probably because
  - c. simply due
  - d. closely related
  - e. strangely thanks
5.
  - a. in spite of
  - b. still less for
  - c. in relation to
  - d. regardless of
  - e. in addition to
6.
  - a. Relatively
  - b. However
  - c. Besides
  - d. Otherwise
  - e. Normally
7.
  - a. it is telling
  - b. it is definite
  - c. it is unclear
  - d. it is strange
  - e. it is unique
8.
  - a. analyze
  - b. add
  - c. include
  - d. break
  - e. categorize
9.
  - a. in step
  - b. in difficulty
  - c. in total
  - d. in proportion
  - e. in value
10.
  - a. Europe will forever blame Britain for the increasing importance of English
  - b. Europe will always remember the linguistic gift Britain is leaving behind
  - c. Europe will someday criticize Britain for its efforts in English education
  - d. Europe will surely modify the linguistic tools Britain gave to the EU
  - e. Europe will certainly refuse to ask Britain for linguistic help in English matters

III

次の英文を読んで下の問いに答えよ。解答はマーク解答用紙にマークせよ。

We often mistakenly see bullying in the workplace as merely a micro level or individual level problem. We fail to recognize how workplace bullying is a systematic, macro level problem that requires a macro level solution. Because we tend to think only about the target, the bully or the organization itself, we tend to get caught up in certain limited solutions, for example, self-help, employer programs or even counseling for

specific bullies. Those solutions leave the majority of targets of bullying unprotected, or think only about organizational level solutions that have simply not been realized. We oftentimes fail to recognize how the vast majority of targets of harassment and bullying are left with no meaningful protection or help. While the US legal system for the most part ignores or even worsens workplace bullying, personnel departments in many companies often do the same.

The reality is that workplace bullying is not a minor problem. It is pervasive. We could even consider it to be an epidemic in the American workplace. Workplace bullying is severe and the effects on targets, workplaces, communities and societies are devastating. The employer community knows about workplace bullying. The fact is bullying continues to be more and more common in national surveys, and these same surveys show that employers are ineffective in addressing workplace bullying; in addition, they are quite often complicit through their own wrongdoing. There are no current adequate legal remedies for workplace bullying, and it has not been addressed in the courts, in the legislatures, or even in unionized workplaces. Nor has it been discussed by employers. The legal system, judges, legislators and such are also accountable both through failure to act as well as through bad actions. It is obvious that workplace bullying is a serious social problem in American society today.

We can divide workplace bullying into three categories of behavior. The first type, individual level bullying, is engaged in at a micro level. The tactics are engaged in through direct interaction between the person that is the bully and the target. This includes the use of any form of communication like yelling, criticizing, threatening or ostracizing and ignoring. A second kind of bullying is organizational policy bullying, where the bully utilizes an organizational policy such as unfair evaluations of the target, overloading the target with work tasks, the assignment of menial tasks, or taking away the voice of the target by stripping him or her of autonomy. Bullies who have the power to implement organizational policies often use this form of bullying. A third type of bullying is by proxy, where the bullies use other employees to torment their targets. Many bullies engage in all of these forms of bullying and many targets experience a combination of all these forms.

Workplace bullying causes incredible amounts of lost productivity, absences, illnesses, psychological damage, trauma, loss of appetite, and even suicide or death as a result of illness caused by workplace stress. Those who are the targets of bullying are stripped of their human dignity, which is the basic foundation of all human rights. They are stripped of various human rights recognized in international documents, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed by the United Nations in 1948. That is because they are denied the right to just and favorable working conditions and the right to a physically and psychologically safe working environment.

Perhaps the most irritating part of the problem is the way that others summarily dismiss the harshness of workplace bullying. In the competitive environment of the present day, workers who are targets of bullying are often told by colleagues and friends that it is a normal part of work. Career advisors also tell these individuals that they are lucky to have a job and in essence not to worry about bullying as it is just part of the job. We have created a society that is frantically paced and competitive, and works according to a kind of selfish capitalism that often supports bullying behavior and bullies at the expense of ordinary people. As a result, many victims of bullying often blame themselves — a condition that is compounded by not having adequate access to remedies or solutions.

Unfortunately, many victims of workplace bullying are unable to pack up and find another job. In addition, if the bully has crushed their self-esteem they are less likely to be able to find other employment or to even feel confident enough to search for another job. To make the problem worse, there is no right to legal recourse for most types of workplace bullying. The law provides protection against only the harshest forms of bullying where obvious intent and psychological damage are both clear and severe.

(Adapted from *Understanding, Defining and Eliminating Workplace Bullying*)

1. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to the phrase get caught up in?
  - a. come up with
  - b. find out about
  - c. attempt to follow
  - d. focus mainly on
  - e. try to escape from
  
2. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to the word complicit?
  - a. criticized
  - b. responsible
  - c. targeted
  - d. active
  - e. questioned
  
3. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to the phrase the most irritating part of the problem?
  - a. the most annoying part of the issue
  - b. the most confusing part of the issue
  - c. the most irrational part of the issue
  - d. the most complicated part of the issue
  - e. the most unpredictable part of the issue
  
4. Which one of the following best explains the phrase pack up?
  - a. make a decision
  - b. arrange matters
  - c. put things away
  - d. feel confident
  - e. decide to quit
  
5. According to this passage, which THREE of the following are true?
  - a. The issue of workplace bullying is not limited to any one country.
  - b. The American workplace is faced with a major bullying problem.
  - c. Bullying in the workplace has not yet been studied or measured.
  - d. Workplace bullying is only carried out by the person who is the bully.
  - e. Companies are not aware that bullying is going on in the workplace.
  - f. Laws to prevent and punish workplace bullying are in general sufficient.
  - g. Workplace bullies always target only those employees who are the most vulnerable.
  - h. One of the serious results of workplace bullying is lost productivity.
  - i. Workplace bullying deprives its victims of several basic human rights.
  - j. It is rare for the victims of bullying to consider themselves responsible.
  - k. Co-workers are the best source of comfort for victims of workplace bullying.
  
6. Which one of the following best describes the main point of this passage?
  - a. American society has many social problems that demand attention.
  - b. Bullying in the workplace is a recent and unique social phenomenon.
  - c. Corporate capitalism is the ultimate cause of macro level social strife.
  - d. Enforcing existing laws will lead to a decrease in workplace bullying.
  - e. Workplace bullying is a complex problem with no easy solutions.

IV

次の英文を読んで下の問いに答えよ。解答はマーク解答用紙にマークせよ。

The latest demographic forecast by a government think tank — that Japan's population will decline by one third in the coming fifty years — points to mounting policy challenges ranging from reduction of the workforce to sustainability of the social security system. Steady and persistent efforts are needed to slow and hopefully reverse the demographic trend, but we Japanese also must explore how we can live with the rapidly shrinking and graying population.

According to the National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, which every five years releases long-term demographic estimates up to fifty years in the future, Japan's population in 2065 will be 88.08 million, which is a roughly 30 percent drop from the 127 million people living in Japan in 2015. That will be equivalent to losing an average of 780,000 people every year.

The population will not just shrink but will be much grayer. People 65 or older will account for an estimated 38.4 percent of the total population, up sharply from 26.6 percent in 2015. There were 2.1 people in the 20-to-64 age bracket for every one person in the elderly ranks in 2015. Fifty years from now, that ratio will be 1.2 to 1. That is a frightening prospect for the social security system, in which welfare programs for retirees are sustained by premium payments from the working population. That Japan had nine working-age adults for each elderly person in 1965 helps to explain the radical changes in population structure.

Indeed, the estimates released last week predict that the population decline will slow down a little compared with the previous forecast: the think tank projected the fertility rate in 2065 to be 1.44, compared with 1.35, which was the estimate made five years ago for 2060. Japan's population is now projected to dip below 100 million in 2053, instead of 2048 in the 2012 forecast. That, however, does not mean significant changes in the long-term trend of population decline and aging.

The nation's population started to decrease after peaking in 2008. The population in 2016 declined by a record 271,834 from the previous year for the seventh annual decrease in a row. The number of newborns last year is estimated to have dipped below 1 million for the first time since the government began gathering such statistics in 1899. That is far below the peak of 2.69 million in 1949. The fertility rate, which is the estimated number of babies born to an average woman in her lifetime, has been inching up since bottoming out at 1.26 in 2005 to reach 1.45 in 2015, but is still far below 2.07, the level deemed necessary to sustain the population. And despite the slow recovery in the fertility rate, the downward trend in the number of newborns is expected to continue given that the number of women in their 20s and 30s — the main child bearing period — has already dwindled.

Alarmed by the rapidly graying and falling population, the Abe administration in 2014 set a goal of maintaining a population of 100 million in 2060, which officials say will be achievable if the administration meets its target of bringing the fertility rate up to 1.8 by the mid-2020s. The government has announced policy steps to support child-rearing by working mothers. It is believed that such steps encouraged more women in their 30s and 40s to have babies, contributing to the increase in fertility rates. The latest estimate, however, emphasizes the fact that these efforts may slow down but will not reverse the demographic trend.

To restore the fertility rate and slow the population decline, measures should continue to be explored to fight problems that discourage the younger generation from marrying and having children, including insecurity over jobs, financial concerns over having a family, or insufficient public support for child-rearing.

At the same time, the government must not shirk from these stark demographic prospects. It must come up with a plan that copes with the shrinking and aging population and start building a public consensus on the best way forward. It cannot avoid such efforts by merely setting out an ambitious population goal.

A fundamental overhaul of the pension system, medical services, and nursing care programs will be inevitable in order to rebalance the benefits to retirees and the burden on the working-age generation. Wealthy retirees will need to be asked to bear an increased share of the cost or face reduced benefits. The demographic estimate shows that the "productive age" population between 15 and 64 in 2065 will have fallen 41 percent from 2015, which is much faster than the decline of the total population. Both in order to secure manpower and contain rising medical and nursing care expenses, efforts will need to be made to help more people 65 or older stay fit and remain in the workforce.

An economy that experiences a 30 percent population decline cannot be sustained the same way it was in the past. Along with the problem of the shrinking manpower supply,

consumer spending, which today accounts for 60 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP), will obviously dwindle. Whether immigration can be a solution for sustaining the economy should be publicly discussed.

A steep population decline and aging as projected in the estimate is already a serious problem in rural Japan, where the population exodus to big metropolitan areas like Tokyo threatens the survival of local communities and the maintenance of basic services. In fact, the Abe administration's "regional revitalization" bid to reverse the population shift makes sense as a partial solution to the nation's population woes. That is because the exodus to Tokyo, where the cost of living is high and the fertility rate is the lowest among the nation's 47 prefectures, worsens the situation. The problem is that the administration's initiatives seem to be making little progress, and the concentration of people and resources in the capital continues undiminished. The government needs to redouble its efforts in this area.

(Adapted from *The Japan Times*)

1. Which one of the following best explains the demographic trend?
  - a. a decrease in the fertility rate and a decrease in female participation in the labor force
  - b. a drop in the male population and an increase in male participation in the labor force
  - c. an increase in the working age population and a decrease in the percentage of senior citizens
  - d. a rapid surge in the fertility rate in all categories and an increase in the total population
  - e. a decline in the total population and an increase in the percentage of senior citizens
  
2. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to the phrase shirk from?
  - a. criticize
  - b. accept
  - c. exaggerate
  - d. overcome
  - e. ignore
  
3. According to this article, which one of the following best describes one of the government's efforts in this area?
  - a. extending forest areas in regions outside the capital in order to control climate change
  - b. improving energy efficiency in the capital so as to achieve energy security in the near future
  - c. providing subsidies to daycare centers in the capital and other regions to promote equal opportunity for females
  - d. moving government offices and people out of the capital to reduce the excessive population concentration there
  - e. transferring resources from rural areas to the capital in order to generate needed tax revenues
  
4. According to this article, which THREE of the following are true?
  - a. A fertility rate of 2.07 is needed to increase the life expectancy of the entire population.
  - b. Reducing the financial burden of raising a family is one measure that should be considered in order to raise the fertility rate.
  - c. Compared with large metropolitan areas, rural areas are experiencing a slower population decline and a faster aging of the population.
  - d. Thirty years ago there were nine people in the 20-to-64 age bracket for every senior citizen in the population.
  - e. The Abe administration believes that government support for raising children will result in an increase in the child mortality rate.



- f. The fertility rate slowly increased during the period from 2005 to 2015.
  - g. The social security system was modified after the bubble economy years because of unexpected demographic changes.
  - h. The government needs to set concrete targets before building a public consensus concerning the effects of demographic changes.
  - i. An increase in government spending can revitalize shrinking economic activities caused by a decline in consumer spending.
  - j. The regional revitalization attempt by the Abe administration is a reasonable option for helping to solve the problems of population decline and an aging population.
  - k. Population decline slowed down in 2017 compared to 2012 due to a drop in the fertility rate.
5. Which one of the following best describes the main point of this article?
- a. The most important thing for the government to do is to solve problems related to population and resource distribution between urban and rural areas.
  - b. While striving to reverse the trend of a declining and aging population, Japan needs to find ways to accept and adapt to the current demographic trend.
  - c. An increase in female participation in the labor market is the key for improving the labor productivity of the working age population.
  - d. An aging population is inevitable in an affluent society, but technology can ease the increasing burdens of the working age population.
  - e. Foreign workers can help sustain the country's economic activities by contributing to the labor market in many sectors of the economy.

V

次の英文を読んで下の問いに答えよ。解答はマーク解答用紙にマークせよ。

Government and expertise rely on each other, especially in a democracy. The technological and economic progress that ensures the well-being of a population requires a division of labor, which in turn leads to the creation of professions. Professionalism encourages experts to do their best to serve their clients, respect their own knowledge boundaries, and demand that their boundaries be respected by others, as part of an overall service to the most important client, which is society itself.

Dictatorships, too, demand this same service of experts, but they extract it by threat and direct its use by command. This is why dictatorships are actually less efficient and less productive than democracies (despite some popular stereotypes to the contrary). In a democracy, the expert's service to the public is part of the social contract. Citizens delegate the power of decision on many issues to elected representatives and their expert advisers, while experts, for their part, ask that their efforts be received in good faith by a public that has informed itself enough—a key requirement—to make reasoned judgments.

This relationship between experts and citizens rests on a foundation of mutual respect and trust. When that foundation erodes, experts and laypeople become warring factions and democracy itself can become a casualty, leading to mob rule or elitist technocracy. Living in a world filled with gadgets and once unimaginable conveniences and entertainments, Americans (and many other Westerners) have become almost childlike in their refusal to learn enough to govern themselves or to guide the policies that affect their lives. This is a collapse of functional citizenship, and it leads to a flood of other terrible consequences.

In the absence of informed citizens, for example, more knowledgeable administrative and intellectual elites do in fact take over the daily direction of the state and society. It has been said that the greatest danger to liberty today comes from the men who are most needed and most powerful in modern government, namely, the efficient expert administrators exclusively concerned with what they regard as the public good.

There is a great deal of truth in this. Unelected bureaucrats and policy specialists in many spheres exert tremendous influence on the daily lives of Americans. Today, however, this situation exists by default rather than by design. And populism actually

reinforces this elitism, because the celebration of ignorance cannot launch communications satellites, negotiate the rights of U.S. citizens overseas, or provide effective medications. Faced with a public that has no idea how most things work, experts disengage, choosing to speak mostly to one another.

Meanwhile, Americans have developed increasingly unrealistic expectations of what their political and economic systems can provide, and these high expectations result in continual disappointment and anger. When people are told that ending poverty or preventing terrorism or stimulating economic growth is a lot harder than it looks, they get bored and roll their eyes. Unable to comprehend all the complexity around them, they choose instead to comprehend almost none of it and then resentfully blame elites for seizing control of their lives.

Experts can only propose; elected leaders dispose. And politicians are very rarely experts on any of the innumerable subjects that come before them for a decision. By definition, nobody can be an expert on China policy and health care and climate change and immigration and taxation, all at the same time. That is why during, say, congressional hearings on a subject, actual experts are usually brought in to advise the elected laypeople charged with making sound decisions.

Americans too easily forget that the form of government under which they live was not designed for mass decisions about complicated issues. Neither, of course, was it designed for rule by a tiny group of technocrats or experts. Rather, it was meant to be the way by which an informed electorate could choose other people to represent them, come up to speed on important questions, and make decisions on the public's behalf.

The workings of such a representative democracy, however, are many times more difficult when the electorate is not competent to judge the matters at hand. Laypeople complain about the rule of experts and demand greater involvement in complicated national questions, but many of them express their anger and make these demands only after giving up their own important role in the process: namely, to stay informed and politically literate enough to choose representatives who can act wisely on their behalf. Ignorant voters end up punishing society at large for their own mistakes.

Too few citizens today understand democracy to mean a condition of political equality in which all are able to vote and are equal in the eyes of the law. Rather, they think of it as a state of actual equality, in which every opinion is as good as any other, regardless of the logic or evidentiary base behind it. But that is not how a republic is meant to work, and the sooner American society establishes new basic rules for productive engagement between educated elites and the society around them, the better.

Experts need to remember, always, that they are the servants of a democratic society and a republican government. Their citizen masters, however, must equip themselves not just with education but also with the kind of civic virtue that keeps them involved in the running of their own country. Laypeople cannot do without experts, and they must accept this reality without getting angry. Experts, likewise, must accept that they get a hearing, not a veto, and that their advice will not always be taken. At the present time, the bonds tying the system together are dangerously weakened. Unless some sort of trust and mutual respect can be restored, public discourse will be polluted by unearned respect for unfounded opinions. And in such an environment, anything and everything becomes possible, including the end of democracy and republican government itself.

(Adapted from *Foreign Affairs*)

1. According to this passage, which THREE of the following are true?
  - a. Specialists can usually be sure that their policies will be acceptable to the government.
  - b. Experts can make various proposals, but only political leaders can carry them out.
  - c. Politicians and experts have similar views of what needs to be done.
  - d. There is little or no mistrust of specialists among most citizens and politicians.
  - e. Policy specialists work mainly for politicians rather than for bureaucrats.
  - f. The American government was so structured as to rely on a small group of experts.

※Web公開にあたり、著作権者の要請により出典追記しております。  
Republished with permission of Foreign Affairs,  
from How America Lost Faith in Expertise, Tom Nichols, Vol.96  
Number2, Dec/31/1969 ; permission conveyed through  
Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.

- g. Most citizens are well informed about the issues and problems of representation.
  - h. It is important that citizens and experts believe in and show respect for one another.
  - i. Citizens often blame bureaucrats for the complexity of the ills faced by societies today.
  - j. Experts are treated in the same way by democratic as well as authoritarian governments.
  - k. Experts and their policies have a great influence on the everyday life of citizens.
  - l. Politicians have traditionally had a deep understanding of the major social issues.
  - m. Voters who are knowledgeable about the issues have a positive effect on society.
2. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to the phrase for their part?
- a. for their own personal benefit
  - b. making a significant contribution
  - c. as much as they personally desire
  - d. in support of their own policies
  - e. speaking on their own behalf
3. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to the phrase by default?
- a. through lack of positive action
  - b. through failure to explain
  - c. through meaningless opposition
  - d. through mistaken viewpoints
  - e. through unnecessary discussions
4. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to the phrase come up to speed?
- a. master the facts as fast as possible
  - b. learn at a very quick pace
  - c. engage in speedy discussions
  - d. have the latest information
  - e. come to a common consensus
5. Which one of the following is closest in meaning to evidentiary base?
- a. important details
  - b. factual foundation
  - c. questionable evidence
  - d. opinionated arguments
  - e. truthful information
6. Which one of the following best explains the meaning of they get a hearing?
- a. they can listen to and discuss other proposals
  - b. they are able to hear what others have to say
  - c. they have a chance to give their opinions
  - d. they get the opportunity to listen to others
  - e. they have to present their objections to the people
7. Which one of the following can we infer from this passage?
- a. Experts will probably continue to play an essential role in American politics.
  - b. Citizens will probably have to get rid of experts and ignore their ideas.
  - c. Experts will probably join hands frequently with politicians to control information.
  - d. Democracies will probably have to increase the power of bureaucratic specialists.
  - e. Elitism will probably endanger the political foundation of all democracies.