

【I】次の文章を読み、(1)～(8)の括弧に当てはまる最も適切なものを、それぞれ(a)～(d)から選び、記号で答えよ。

Partly because it has degenerated into something of a slogan, the term “multiculturalism” is apt to give rise to all manner of misunderstanding, and it is wise to begin by distinguishing between the adjective *multicultural* and the epithet *multiculturalism*. There is, first of all, the social fact (1) America, a country of immigrants, has always been a multicultural and multiethnic society. Indeed, it is our country’s singular political achievement to have forged a society in which vast religious, ethnic, and racial differences are subordinated to the higher unity of national identity. Hence the once-defining image of America as a “(2).”

We have all become familiar with the kinds of foolishness that the demand for “multiculturalism” and “political correctness” has brought to our schools and college campuses. The (3) of Western civilization as inextricably racist, sexist, elitist, and patriarchal; the efforts by college administrations to enforce speech codes on college campuses; the blatant rewriting of history text books to (4) wounded ethnic feelings: all are transforming the nature of American society.

At the center of the multicultural ethos is the contention that all cultures are equally valuable and, therefore, that preferring one culture, intellectual heritage, or moral and social order to another is to be (5) of ethnocentrism and racism. Preferring Western culture and its heritage to others is held to be especially ethnocentric and racist. The thoughtless egalitarianism behind these ideas helps to explain the current academic obsession with the notion of “difference” and the widespread insistence that the differences that separate us—pre-eminently, differences of race, class, sexuality, and ethnic heritage—must be given (6) over our common humanity.

This celebration of “difference” may sound like a prescription for tolerance and genuine pluralism. But in fact it has fostered a positively Orwellian situation in which “diversity” really means strict intellectual conformity, and “tolerance” is (7) exclusively for those who subscribe to one’s own perspective. As has been widely reported in the press, attempts to enforce the ethic of “difference” have led to egregious violations of academic freedom and have poisoned the atmosphere for honest intellectual exchange at campuses across the country. Multiculturalism has provided a convenient umbrella for the smorgasbord of radical ideologies now regnant in the academy. Despite their differences, the one thing your literary deconstructionist, your Lacanian feminist, your post-structuralist Marxist, your New Historicist, and your devotee of what goes under the name of Cultural Studies can (8) on is that the Western humanistic tradition is a repository of ideas that are naïve, repressive, or both.

(Adapted from Roger Kimball, *Tempered Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education*, 3rd ed., Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2008, pp. 283-86.)

※1 Web公開にあたり、著作権者の要請により、以下に出典を追記しております。

- | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 1. (a) about | (b) in | (c) that | (d) which |
| 2. (a) melting pot | (b) nourishing dish | (c) salad bowl | (d) vegetable plate |
| 3. (a) appreciation | (b) association | (c) denunciation | (d) pronunciation |
| 4. (a) conceal | (b) ignore | (c) provoke | (d) soothe |
| 5. (a) critical | (b) guilty | (c) independent | (d) wary |
| 6. (a) concern | (b) control | (c) evidence | (d) priority |
| 7. (a) purchased | (b) reserved | (c) substituted | (d) suspended |
| 8. (a) agree | (b) call | (c) compromise | (d) trespass |

※1

Used with permission of ,Ivan R.Deer from Postscript ,Roger Kimball,2008;
permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.

【Ⅱ】次の文章を読み、下の設問に答えよ。

Traditionally, national identity has often been understood as something coherent and fixed, an essential quality of a group of people that is guaranteed by the ‘nature’ of a particular territorial space. However, although identities are clearly about ‘who we think we are’ and ‘where we think we came from’, they are also about ‘where we are going’. ⁽¹⁾National identities are always a narrative of the nation becoming; as much about ‘routes’ as they are about ‘roots’. In other words, nations are never only ever invented once: invention is always followed by reinvention. History is full of examples of where powerful national figures and national institutions have engaged in creating new symbols, new ceremonies and new stories of historical origins as a means to present the nation to itself and to the world in a new and positive way. Although Britain is an invented nation, only sixty-nine years older than the United States of America, it is not unusual to hear British politicians make grand claims, usually in response to what they perceive as the interference of ‘Europe’, about 1,000 years of glorious British history being under threat. Thus, nations often seem rooted in the very nature that provides them with their geographical space. ⁽²⁾Part of the sense of belonging is bound up in the way the territory itself is articulated symbolically, making the fit between nature and nation seem natural.

National identity is a form of identification. What we are invited to identify with is what Benedict Anderson calls an ‘imagined community’. Anderson demonstrates how nationality, or nationness, is constructed using cultural artefacts. A nation ‘is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’. What distinguishes all nations is how they imagine themselves. The former are relations of national belonging, the latter are relations of, for example, social class, ethnicity, gender and generation. ⁽³⁾Whereas belonging to the nation is a membership supposedly based on equality, vertical relations are rarely, if ever, other than relations of inequality. If a nation is to remain cohesive, horizontal relations must always work to control the potential disruptive effect of vertical relations. As seen in the examples such as the role of war in the construction of Britain, Anderson observes that ⁽⁴⁾nation-building involves constructing an imagined community in which, in spite of the existence of obvious inequalities, horizontal relationships appear more important than vertical relations.

(Adapted from John Storey, ‘Becoming British’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Modern British Culture*,
Cambridge University Press, 2010, pp. 13-15.)

※2 Web公開にあたり、著作権者の要請により以下に出典追記しております。

1. 下線部(1)を和訳せよ。
2. 下線部(2)を和訳せよ。
3. 下線部(3)を和訳せよ。
4. 下線部(4)を和訳せよ。
5. 以下の1文を本文中のふさわしい位置に挿入した時、その直後に来る2語を記せ。

A nation always consists of both horizontal and vertical relations.

〔以下余白〕

※2
Storey, J. (2010). Becoming British. In M. Higgins, C. Smith, & J. Storey (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Modern British Culture* (Cambridge Companions to Culture, pp. 12-25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CCOL9780521864978.002

受験番号	
氏名	

この欄以外に受験番号氏名を書かないこと。

2021年度 早稲田大学大学院文学研究科入学試験

解答用紙（横書）

【修士課程】 一般外国語 英語

総 点

--

【Ⅰ】

- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____
- (4) _____
- (5) _____
- (6) _____
- (7) _____
- (8) _____

【Ⅱ】

1. _____
- _____
- _____

（裏へ続く）

【Ⅱ】

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

[以下余白]