

I 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に日本語で答えなさい。

The sharp rise in the number of people seeking humanitarian¹ protections over the last decade and the increase in international migration more generally have sharpened the focus on which labels should⁽¹⁾ be used to refer to people crossing borders. Should they be called “migrants?” “Refugees?” Some other term? While these words may carry legal meanings, their colloquial² usage varies, and language used by media organizations, politicians, and, in general, public discourse³ has increasingly come under new scrutiny⁴. For instance, few of the millions of people fleeing Russia’s invasion into Ukraine have applied for and have been granted the particular and narrow legal status of a refugee, yet this is the word that has overwhelmingly been used to refer to them. Years earlier, public figures were much more divided over how to refer to the more than 2 million individuals who arrived in Europe during the crisis of 2015-16.

Often, advocates for both more and less immigration use language to bolster⁵ their positions and convey messages about individuals arriving at their borders. For example, some seek to claim labeling advantage by calling the foreign born “illegal aliens” rather than “unauthorized immigrants.” Research has shown that these choices can be effective; words matter, particularly for influencing public perceptions. For instance, people in multiple immigrant destination countries are more likely to support admitting people described as “refugees” than those described as “immigrants,” according to a 2019 Pew Research Center survey. A similar experiment conducted for the author’s book *Crossing: How We Label and React to People on the Move* also found that respondents in the United States were significantly more likely to say their country had an obligation to help people described as “vulnerable refugees” rather than “vulnerable

migrants.” In other words, even when both groups were explicitly portrayed as vulnerable, people’s perceptions were still impacted by use of the word “refugee” versus “migrant.” These findings are supported by cognitive science research demonstrating that opinions can be swayed by strategic use of terminology, and that favorable word choice of the same set of facts can significantly shape people’s view of a situation.⁽²⁾

The distinction between “refugee” and “migrant” has been hotly contested particularly since the arrival of some 2 million individuals at EU borders in 2015 and 2016. Technically, refugee status has a discrete legal meaning that usually stems from the 1951 Refugee Convention and is available only to individuals who can prove they fled their origin country due to a well-founded fear of persecution because of their race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. Receiving refugee status can be a long and complicated procedure that involves extended processing through agencies such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) or a national government.

Recent events have complicated this situation. The vast majority of people fleeing Ukraine will benefit from the European Union’s Temporary Protection Directive, which will permit residence and work rights for up to three years and is distinct from refugee status in several ways. Still, they have widely been referred to as “refugees.” For instance, the BBC in March chose to refer to people fleeing Ukraine as “a wave of refugees,” among other terms, even though the use of “wave” conventionally suggests that arrivals at the border are uncontrollable and pose a threat on par with⁶ natural disasters. The BBC’s decision of this word choice seems to be in line with the generally greater sympathy that Western media and public figures have seemed to show Ukrainians compared to those who arrived in the 2015-16 era, which critics have alleged⁷ is due to cultural similarities, geopolitical interests in countering Russia, and a legacy of

racism.

To avoid the challenges of the migrant/refugee binary⁸, some analysts have advocated for alternative terms. For example, within some academic and research corners, the phrase “forced migrant” has arisen as an alternative to “refugee,” which focuses on the forced nature of the movement rather than the legal status. Along the same lines, scholar Alexander Betts has coined the term “survival migration” to refer to people who had to move in order to live, even if they did not meet the legal definition of a refugee. His work is part of an effort to call upon the international community to create more categories of legal protection beyond refugee status. Similarly, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) has pushed the term “vulnerable migrants” to refer to people needing protection and assistance, even if they are not refugees, including victims of trafficking⁹. IOM has organized a special task force within its agency designed to identify and help such people.

All these terms are more inclusive than “refugee,” but they notably do not have legal meaning. Their usage is intended as strategic framing¹⁰ to remind people that there are individuals deserving of care and compassion who do not fit the legal definition of a refugee. Without visa categories and protection regimes to accommodate such people, however, the terms⁽⁵⁾ carry only symbolic weight.

(Adapted from a work by Rebecca Hamlin)

(注)

- | | |
|-----------------|-------|
| 1. humanitarian | 人道的な |
| 2. colloquial | 慣用的な |
| 3. discourse | 議論 |
| 4. scrutiny | 検討 |
| 5. bolster | 高める |
| 6. on par with | ～と同等の |
| 7. allege | 主張する |
| 8. binary | 二分法 |
| 9. trafficking | 人身売買 |
| 10. framing | 枠組み |

(設問)

〔1〕下線部(1)which labels should be used to refer to people crossing bordersの背景にはどのような問題が根底にあるのかを説明しなさい。

〔2〕下線部(2)favorable word choice of the same set of facts can significantly shape people's view of a situationの内容を本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい。

〔3〕下線部(3)refugee statusとあるが、その法的な定義を本文の内容に即して説明しなさい。

〔4〕下線部(4)the generally greater sympathyとあるが、ヨーロッパのメディアがウクライナからの難民を以前ヨーロッパに押し寄せた難民とをなぜ区別しているのか答えなさい。

〔5〕下線部(5)the terms carry only symbolic weightとあるが、その内容を本文の内容に即してわかりやすく説明しなさい。

Ⅱ 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に**英語**で答えなさい。極力、本文とは異なる表現を用いること。下線部(1)～(5)は問〔1〕～〔5〕にそれぞれ関連している。なお、この英文は2024年1月21日に書かれたものである。

Not bad — but not great either. That summed up the mood as the World Economic Forum ended in Davos, Switzerland in January 2024 with a panel on the state of the global economy. Not bad because most countries outperformed expectations of a year ago. Not bad because sharply rising interest rates didn't plunge the US, the Eurozone, and the UK into recession¹. Not bad because the war between Israel and Hamas had failed to send oil prices shooting above \$100 a barrel.

Not great because central banks face a balancing act² between cutting interest rates too quickly and reigniting inflation or keeping them too high and risking recession. Not great because the early weeks of 2024 have led to a wider Middle East conflict, with implications³ for one of the world's main trade routes. And not great because — as Davos showed — the global economy is deeply fractured⁴. Inevitably, there is a risk that things will turn out badly in 2024. One leading global policymaker, speaking privately, said that repeated blows since 2020 meant it would be wise to⁽¹⁾ be braced for the next surprise shock. Only the most incurable optimist⁵ would quibble with that.

Potential shocks abound. Washington and Beijing are in a grim struggle for economic supremacy. The gap between north and south is widening, and liberal democracy is being challenged by a new breed of autocrats⁶ and populists⁷. Across the globe, there are divergent⁸ and often competing visions of what constitutes progress and success. And the planet continues to heat up.

Even so, the death of globalization has been much exaggerated. The reach of the multinational companies and the banks that continue to flock

to the World Economic Forum were evidence of that. As is the rapid growth of artificial intelligence (AI), part of a tech revolution that cuts across borders and which is leaving national regulators floundering⁹ in its wake. A year ago, ChatGPT was in its infancy. This year, AI was central to the Davos debate, with some hailing its potential to help solve pressing problems — such as the climate crisis — and others doggedly¹⁰ warning of its risks.

So, globalization is not dead, nor even on its last legs. The same goes for western liberal democracy.⁽²⁾ To be sure, productivity has been weak and living standards have been squeezed in recent years. Germany's finance minister, Christian Lindner, raised eyebrows when he said his country was the tired man of Europe. But there are good reasons why there are no TV pictures of asylum seekers¹¹ trying to get into Russia or China.

What is true is that having been pushed on to the defensive, global capitalism is morphing into something different. Peak globalization — along with peak Davos — happened a while ago, around the time of the global financial crisis of 2008. Repeated shocks since then have changed the dynamics of the globalized world, even more so after 2020. Everything since the arrival of the COVID pandemic has pointed to a new paradigm: some call it de-globalization, others call it — perhaps more accurately — “glocalization.”

An awkward term, glocalization points to an ambiguous⁽³⁾¹² state of affairs. It is not the inter-dependent global free market, and it is not autarky (a nation that operates in a state of self-reliance), but something in between. It involves shorter supply chains, an emphasis on building back domestic manufacturing capacity, and a more strategic role for government. The degree of glocalization varies from country to country, industry to industry, but, in general, it should mean that the “local” is better reflected in how a country participates in the “global” economy.

Where once Davos lionized¹³ frictionless supply chains stretching from producers in China to consumers in the developed countries of Europe and North America, now there is a recognition that low cost is not everything. For example, there is value in governments knowing that they will not run short of vaccines, protective equipment, computer chips, or energy. Attacks on cargo vessels in the Red Sea, necessitating much longer journeys around the Cape of Good Hope, is just the latest example of how vulnerable long supply chains have become.

The long-term roots of glocalization lie in the increasingly fractious¹⁴ relationship between the US and China⁽⁴⁾—a relationship that has been deteriorating since Washington woke up to the threat posed by China’s rapid growth and its apparent plan to use its economic power to challenge the US’s global hegemony¹⁵. Chinese ambition, in turn, has stoked American determination to be less reliant on Chinese imports and rebuild its domestic industrial base through active government intervention. While the shift towards onshoring¹⁶ previously outsourced production might have happened anyway, it has certainly been accelerated by the events of the past four years: a pandemic, supply chain bottlenecks, a surge in inflation, and the war in Ukraine.

The outcome is that domestic industrial policy is no longer an unpopular topic, even among the globally-oriented attendees at the World Economic Forum in Davos. Similarly, forms of glocalization may also help nations proactively address environmental issues⁽⁵⁾. Nick Stern, author of the influential report on the economics of climate change, thinks there is a potential sweet spot where the demands for stronger growth and the fight against global warming intersect. Modern eco-friendly production methods and shorter supply chains that result in lower emissions are one potential benefit. Likewise, liberal democracies often have stricter environmental standards. Although pushback by the fossil fuel industry against steps to

combat global warming can be expected, Stern insists investing in new green projects would be both good for growth as well as being environmentally and fiscally responsible. A green light for green growth plans, in other words. And glocalization in action.

(Adapted from a work by Larry Elliott)

⟨Notes⟩

1. recession: a general decline in economic activity with broad effects for society
2. balancing act: an action or activity that requires a delicate balance between different situations or requirements
3. implications: showing potential to effect or influence outcomes
4. fractured: broken, damaged, or not functioning properly
5. optimist: one who is hopeful and expects good outcomes
6. autocrat: a person (such as a monarch) ruling with unlimited authority or power
7. populist: a political position that claims to represent the common people
8. divergent: starkly differing from a common point or standard
9. flounder: to clumsily struggle to move or respond with an appropriate action
10. doggedly: marked by stubborn determination or persistence
11. asylum seekers: one seeking protection from a government; a political refugee
12. ambiguous: obscure, unclear, or indistinct; able to be understood in multiple ways
13. lionize: to treat as an object of great interest and importance
14. fractious: troublesome; marked by conflict or argument
15. hegemony: social, ideological, or economic influence held by a dominant actor
16. onshore: to bring industrial production back to a country, in contrast to “offshoring” or “outsourcing” factories abroad

〈Questions〉

- [1] What situations may contribute to new “surprise shocks” the author suggests may potentially affect the global economy? *Answer in approximately 35 words.*
- [2] What is the author’s opinion about the difficulties faced by Western liberal democracy? *Answer in approximately 30 words.*
- [3] How does the author characterize “glocalization” as distinct from a fully global economy? *Answer in approximately 35 words.*
- [4] How has the competitive relationship between the US and China encouraged “glocalization”? *Answer in approximately 30 words.*
- [5] What potential environmental benefits are possible in a “glocalized” economy? *Answer in approximately 30 words.*