

2025年度 博士後期課程入学試験 ・ 2024年度 外国語能力試験 問題

外国語

A

英語

早稲田大学大学院法学研究科

以下のⅠとⅡの問題に答えなさい。

Ⅰ 次の文章を読んで、後の問いに日本語で答えなさい。

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

問1 下線部(1)のinstitutionsとはどのようなものか。適切な訳語を当てた上で、貨幣を例にとって説明しなさい。

問2 下線部(2)のrulesは具体的にどのようなものを指すか。二種のfootballそれぞれについて述べなさい。

問3 下線部(3)を訳しなさい。

問4 下線部(4)について、本文で述べられていることをまとめなさい。

外国語

B-1

英語

早稲田大学大学院法学研究科

Ⅱ 次の(イ)～(ニ)の中から2問を選択して答えなさい。

必ず選択した番号を明記すること。

(イ)

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

(ロ)

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

外国語

B-2

英語

早稲田大学大学院法学研究科

(ハ)

Cries of private censorship abound in the digital age. What those who decry social media “censorship” mean when they use the term varies. Some critics use the term to accuse the social media companies of applying the rules that govern speech on their platforms inconsistently, to the disadvantage of certain viewpoints of speakers. Others use the term to refer generally to the power that private companies possess to decide what counts as acceptable or unacceptable speech on social media. What unites these complaints of platform censorship is the fear that underpins them: namely, that the private and almost exclusively for-profit companies that control the platforms may use that control to distort public debate and to deny equal access to the social, political, and economic goods that the platforms provide. While the lack of transparency about the content moderation practices of the social media companies makes it hard to reach general conclusions about whether and to what extent political bias, or other kinds of bias, influences their operation, the broad discretion that these companies currently enjoy to regulate the speech that flows through their platforms makes it entirely possible that they might, or already do, discriminate against certain viewpoints of speakers, either because of their ideological convictions or because it suits their economic or political interests to do so. And there is no question that individual speakers are denied access to the platforms all the time for reasons that are hard to fathom.

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。

Lokier, Genevieve. “Social Media, Freedom of Speech and the Future of Our Democracy.” In *The Limits of Antidiscrimination Law in the Digital Public Sphere*, 179. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022. Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSClear.

(ニ)

In 2000, the UN Global Compact was issued. The UNGC includes four principles which relate to ‘Labour.’ Word-for-word these four are same as those in the ILOs 1998 Declaration. The UNGC appeals to companies voluntarily to align their practices with these principles and to report on their progress. Many thousands of companies have joined, but the UNGC has experienced some difficulty in persuading companies even to report. The UNGC's skimpy explanation of the meaning of the four labour rights makes it impossible to determine the level of commitment of the signatory companies....

In international law, human rights are those rights listed in certain international covenants or Conventions, with ratifying States obliged to ensure that the right is applied in law and practice. This universalist view of human rights does not mesh easily with the CSR approach adopted by some companies that they can voluntarily decide whether to assume the obligation of observing human rights and if so, to decide for themselves what exactly the right means. Some companies may have signed the UN Global Compact without fully realizing that the UNGC incorporates the four principles set forth in the 1998 ILO Declaration, which links these principles to eight core Conventions. Such companies may have committed to respect principles such as freedom of association because they assumed they could define what this meant. Those holding such a view were disabused of its validity by the adoption of the UN Guiding Principles.

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。

From *Research Handbook on Transnational Labour Law*. Adelle Blackett, Anne Trebilcock eds., pp.190. Copyright © 2015 by Edward Elgar Publishing. Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSClear.