

I 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に日本語で答えなさい。

Most immigrants¹ come to the rich societies of the West with the hope of dramatically improving their economic prospects. That economic motivations are most important is shown by the high volume of immigrant moves from low-income to high-income societies.⁽¹⁾

The hope for economic gain explains the “immigrant bargain”⁽²⁾—the initial willingness to accept low-level jobs, such as cleaning floors, in exchange for the possibility of future advances, even when immigrants arrive with educational and professional qualifications that brought significant status in their home societies. Immigrants expect to work hard but to see their economic position improve over time. Even more, many hope that their children can reach economic heights that they themselves cannot and that would have been impossible in their societies of origin.

Yet, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the terms of the immigrant bargain may be changing⁽³⁾ in ways that could disappoint these hopes. The serious alterations to the economic structures of the rich societies at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first centuries raise doubts about the degree to which immigrants and their children will gain from their move. One important trend is the growth of economic inequality. This trend is most apparent in the United States and some other so-called liberal market economies² (such as Great Britain), but it is occurring elsewhere as well, in such social democratic welfare states³ as Norway and Sweden. The growth of income and earnings inequalities implies that those at the bottom of the economic ladder, a group that includes many immigrants, face a longer climb than before to reach the middle class.

A related trend in most rich societies is the expansion of the low-wage sectors of the workforce.⁴ This trend, too, is not limited to the liberal

market economies but includes countries such as Germany, a self-conscious social market economy⁵ where the state is supposed to play a greater role in smoothing out the frictions⁶ of the marketplace. Along with low-wage jobs have come other labor-force developments associated with more marginal⁷ forms of employment, such as the expansion of part-time work and short-term jobs. As one might expect, immigrants are overrepresented⁸ in the low-wage sector.

These trends are already affecting the countries in our study in different ways partly because of their institutional variations in regulation of the labor market and in social-welfare provision. In these respects, the six countries divide evenly, between one set of three—Canada, Great Britain, and the United States—where the pressure of the regulatory body⁹ on employers is light and the net of social welfare protecting individuals with inadequate or no labor-market earnings is weak; and the other set of three—France, Germany, and the Netherlands—where greater levels of protection are afforded to workers and social-welfare support is stronger. This distinction is at play in a familiar pair of linked arguments:⁽⁴⁾ on the one hand, that immigrants are more likely to be in the labor force in the United States, and less likely to be unemployed, than in continental¹⁰ Western Europe; and on the other, that immigrant minorities in Europe have access to more generous social welfare provisions than are available in the United States. These arguments are not wrong; indeed they are an important part of the story. But they simplify, and indeed somewhat distort,¹¹ the way immigrants have performed in the labor markets in Western Europe and North America.

The incomes of many immigrant families are low, exposing them to economic marginality, even poverty. Average incomes tend to be lower for low-status immigrant families than for native ones. The concentration of immigrant families at the very bottom of the income scale is more severe

than average household income data convey. For immigrants from outside the EU in the Western European countries, the risk of falling to the bottom is everywhere more than 50 percent higher than it is for native families; and it is close to three times as great in France.

One might object that the statistical¹² data yield a darker picture of the
(5) immigrant economic situation than is justified. After all, most immigrants have the option of returning to their home countries if they find their situations unacceptable; that so many have chosen to stay suggests that they find life near the bottom of a wealthy society preferable to that in their places of origin. There is a truth to this observation, but it overlooks the importance of the first generation's economic position for the start that the second generation receives. The data on poverty indicate that many children of immigrants, for whom the option of returning to the home countries of their parents is unrealistic, are starting at or near the bottom of the wealthy societies. The fragility¹³ of the immigrant bargain in the early twenty-first century is likely to continue, then, to have reverberations¹⁴ for the second generation.

(Adapted from a work by Richard Alba and Nancy Foner)

Republished with permission of Princeton University Press, from *Strangers No More: Immigration and the Challenges of Integration in North America and Western Europe* by Richard Alba and Nancy Foner; permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.

(注)

1. immigrant	移民
2. liberal market economy	自由主義市場経済
3. social democratic welfare state	社会民主主義的福祉国家
4. workforce	労働力人口
5. social market economy	社会的市場経済
6. friction	<small>あつれき</small> 軋轢
7. marginal	周縁的な
8. overrepresent	過剰に代表する
9. regulatory body	規制当局
10. continental	大陸の
11. distort	歪曲する
12. statistical	統計的な
13. fragility	もろさ
14. reverberation	反響

〈 設 問 〉

〔1〕 下線部(1)を訳しなさい。

〔2〕 下線部(2)にある the “immigrant bargain” とは何を意味するのか、説明しなさい。

〔3〕 下線部(3)で言及されている the terms of the immigrant bargain の「変化」の原因は何と説明されているか、述べなさい。

〔4〕 下線部(4)にある a familiar pair of linked arguments とは何を指すのか、説明しなさい。

〔5〕 下線部(5)について、次の問い(a), (b)に答えなさい。

(a) 下線部(5)の「反論」の内容を述べなさい。

(b) (a)の「反論」の根拠を説明しなさい。