

〔 I 〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

No matter where you stand on the question of building a mosque near Ground Zero, you have to hand one thing to the framers of this issue: They understood the power of words to create and perpetuate an issue.

Calling the proposed Islamic cultural center in Lower Manhattan a “Ground Zero mosque” stirs up a far more passionate response on either side of the issue than calling it “an Islamic cultural center and mosque in Lower Manhattan.” Strictly speaking, the proposed 13-story edifice at 51 Park Place isn’t exactly a mosque, at least not as that term is generally understood (domes, minarets, etc.), and certainly isn’t going to be a mosque that’s 13 stories tall.

The proposed building would contain many things—a cooking school, basketball courts, a swimming pool, child-care facilities, a restaurant, a library, an auditorium, a Sept. 11 memorial (!) and, yes, a Muslim house of worship, or mosque. It would be located two blocks from a corner of the Ground Zero site, in a neighborhood already packed with places of worship, including another Muslim prayer house that predates the events of Sept. 11, 2001.

Read the preceding paragraph and ask yourself: Doesn’t “Mosque at Ground Zero” sound more like the sort of thing that could get opponents like Newt Gingrich to declare the project “a political statement of radical Islamist triumph”?

Politicians, revolutionaries, editors and advertisers have long understood the power of a single word to recast and reframe an issue to explosive effect. By calling the estate tax the “death tax,” conservatives broadened a narrow debate over the obligations of wealthy families into a question of taxation for all. Similarly, “pre-owned” vehicles sound a lot nicer than “used” ones.

Journalists, at least the ones still obligated to neutrality, have tried to dance around loaded phrases for years. <sup>(7)</sup>

Is Israel’s barrier on the West Bank and Gaza Strip a “security fence” or a “separation wall”? Are they “illegal aliens” or “undocumented workers”? Is it fair to label someone who opposes abortion “pro-life” when doing so suggests that an opponent is “anti-life”?

In Washington, naming a piece of legislation is a dark semantic art, fraught with deception and political manipulation. No matter what their flaws or merits, on name alone, it’s hard to be against something called “the Patriot Act” or the “the Clean Skies Act.” <sup>(1)</sup> Calling anything a “reform” or “progressive” initiative implies that the reform is necessary or that opponents are regressive.

The general rule in navigating this minefield is clarity and accuracy, says Teresa Schmedding, president of the American Copy Editors Society, an organization dedicated to

maintaining both of those things in newspapers, magazines and Web sites.

“Terms that get caught up in religious or political ideology can be misleading, so we try to avoid those,” she says. But even “neutral” labels have limitations and can be misleading, she adds. If you oppose abortion except in cases of incest and rape, are you therefore “quasi-pro-life,” she asks. If you oppose abortion but are in favor of the death penalty, what are you then? (The Associated Press and The Washington Post are advising their journalists to avoid the terms “Ground Zero mosque” or “mosque at Ground Zero” because they’re inaccurate.)

Corporations try to play the opposite game. Instead of bland neutrality, they spend millions of dollars annually on names they hope will evoke a positive, emotional connection with consumers, says Hayes Roth, the chief marketing officer of Landor Associates, a company that creates names for marketers and organizations.

Ideally, he says, a great brand name is connected to “a great story.” Apple, for example, is an ingeniously simple and resonant name for a computer because it suggests simplicity, familiarity and ease of use, all attributes for a potentially intimidating device like a computer.

This is where the promoters of the downtown Islamic cultural center/mosque may have let events slip beyond their control, he suggests: They didn’t come up with a name that would have blunted the emotional uppercut of “mosque near Ground Zero.”

(出典 *The Washington Post* より)

## Notes

perpetuate: to make (something) continue for a long time.

edifice: a building, especially a large one.

minaret: a tall thin tower on a mosque, from which Muslims are called to prayer.

auditorium: the part of a theater, concert hall, or other public building in which the audience sits.

predate: to exist or occur at a date earlier than (something).

Newt Gingrich: 共和党所属の元下院議長.

recast: to give (something) a new shape or a new form of organization.

neutrality (*n.*) < neutral (*adj.*)

semantic: relating to the meanings of words.

“the Patriot Act”: 「愛国者法」

“the Clean Skies Act”: 「大気清浄法」

fraught with: = full of.

regressive: returning to an earlier, less advanced state.

minefield: an area where a lot of bombs have been hidden just below the ground or under water.

incest: sex between people who are closely related in a family.

quasi-: like something else or trying to be something else.

resonant: having the ability to evoke enduring images, memories, or emotions.

- (1) 下線部(ア)と同じ意味の表現を本文中より抜き出さない。(3語)
- (2) 下線部(イ)を和訳しなさい。
- (3) 下線部(ウ)のように言える根拠を本文に即して日本語であげなさい。
- (4) 本文に即して、企業が製品の命名に成功した実例をあげ、さらに、その成功の理由を日本語で述べなさい。

〔 II 〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

Research has shown that the illusion of control over chance events is enhanced in financial, sports, and especially, business situations when the outcome of a chance task is preceded by a period of strategizing (those endless meetings), when performance of the task requires active involvement (those long hours at the office), or when competition is present (this never happens, right?). The first step in battling the illusion of control is to be aware of it. But even then it is difficult, for, as we shall see in the following pages, once we think we see a pattern, we do not easily let go of our perception.

Suppose I tell you that I have made up a rule for the construction of a sequence of three numbers and that the sequence 2, 4, 6 satisfies my rule. Can you guess the rule? A single set of three numbers is not a lot to go on, so let's pretend that if you present me with other sequences of three numbers, I will tell you whether or not they satisfy my rule. Please take a moment to think up some three-number sequences to test.

Now that you have considered your strategy, I can say that if you are like most people, the sequences you present will look something like 4, 6, 8 or 8, 10, 12 or 20, 24, 30. Yes, those sequences obey my rule. So what's the rule? Most people, after presenting a handful of such test cases, will grow confident and conclude that the rule is that the sequence must consist of increasing even numbers. But actually my rule was simply that the series must consist of increasing numbers. The sequence 1, 2, 3, for example, would have fit; there was no need for the numbers to be even. Would the sequences you thought of have revealed this?

When we are in the grasp of an illusion—or, for that matter, whenever we have a new idea—instead of searching for ways to prove our ideas wrong, we usually attempt to prove them correct. Psychologists call this the confirmation bias, and it presents a major barrier to our ability to break free from the misinterpretation of randomness. In the example above, most people immediately recognize that the sequence consists of increasing even numbers. Then, seeking to confirm their guess, they try out many more sequences of that type. But very few find the answer the fast way—through the attempt to falsify their idea by testing a sequence that includes an odd number. As philosopher Francis Bacon put it in 1620, “the human understanding, once it has adopted an opinion, collects any instances that confirm it, and though the contrary instances may be more numerous and more important, it either does not notice them or else rejects them, in order that this opinion will remain unshaken.”

To make matters worse, not only do we preferentially seek evidence to confirm our preconceived notions, but we also interpret ambiguous evidence in favor of our ideas. This can be a big problem because data are often ambiguous, so by ignoring some patterns and

emphasizing others, our clever brains can reinforce their beliefs even in the absence of convincing data. For instance, if we conclude, based on weak evidence, that a new neighbor is unfriendly, then any future actions that might be interpreted in that light stand out in our minds, and those that don't are easily forgotten. Or if we believe in a politician, then when she achieves good results, we credit her, and when she fails, we blame circumstances or the other party, either way reinforcing our initial ideas.

In one study that illustrated the effect rather vividly, researchers gathered a group of undergraduates, some of whom supported the death penalty and some of whom were against it. The researchers then provided all the students with the same set of academic studies on the effectiveness of capital punishment. Half the studies supported the idea that the death penalty has a deterrent effect; the other half contradicted that idea. The researchers also gave the subjects clues hinting at the weak points in each of the studies. Afterward the undergraduates were asked to rate the quality of the studies individually and whether and how strongly their attitudes about the death penalty were affected by their reading. The participants gave higher ratings to the studies that confirmed their initial point of view even when the studies on both sides had supposedly been carried out by the same method. And in the end, though everyone had read all the same studies, both those who initially supported the death penalty and those who initially opposed it reported that reading the studies had strengthened their beliefs. Rather than convincing anyone, the data polarized the group. Thus even random patterns can be interpreted as compelling evidence if they relate to our preconceived notions.

The confirmation bias has many unfortunate consequences in the real world. When a teacher initially believes that one student is smarter than another, he selectively focuses on evidence that tends to confirm the hypothesis. When an employer interviews a prospective candidate, the employer typically forms a quick first impression and spends the rest of the interview seeking information that supports it. When counselors in clinical settings are advised ahead of time that an interviewee is combative, they tend to conclude that he is even if the interviewee is no more combative than the average person. And when people interpret the behavior of someone who is a member of a minority, they interpret it in the context of preconceived stereotypes.

The human brain has evolved to be very efficient at pattern recognition, but as the confirmation bias shows, we are focused on finding and confirming patterns rather than minimizing our false conclusions. Yet we needn't be pessimists, for it is possible to overcome our prejudices. It is a start simply to realize that chance events, too, produce patterns. It is another great step if we learn to question our perceptions and our theories. Finally, we should learn to spend as much time looking for evidence that we are wrong as we spend searching for reasons we are correct.

(出典 *The Drunkard's Walk* より)

## Notes

enhance: to improve (something).

strategize: to make up or determine strategy.

confirmation (*n.*) < confirm (*v.*)

misinterpretation (*n.*) < misinterpret (*v.*): to interpret incorrectly.

randomness (*n.*) < random (*adj.*)

falsify: to prove to be false.

unshaken: not having changed your attitude or belief.

preferentially (*adv.*) < preferential (*adj.*)

preconceived: formed before having the evidence for its truth or usefulness.

deterrent: serving or tending to deter.

supposedly: according to what is generally believed.

polarize: to divide into two sharply contrasting groups.

selectively (*adv.*) < selective (*adj.*)

pessimist: someone who always expects that bad things will happen.

- (1) 下線部(ア)はどのようなものか具体的に日本語で説明しなさい。
- (2) 下線部(イ)を和訳しなさい。ただし it が何を指しているのかを明確にすること。
- (3) 下線部(ウ)とは何か、本段落に示された具体例に即して日本語で説明しなさい。
- (4) 下線部(エ)を和訳しなさい。
- (5) 下線部(オ)の方法を本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

〔Ⅲ〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

I was looking to return to New Orleans, where I'd grown up, to write a book. The move would uproot my wife and three children from California, and I felt a little bad about that. They needed a place to live, but places to live in New Orleans are hard to find. Ever since Hurricane Katrina, the real estate market there has been in turmoil. Owners want to sell, buyers want to rent, and the result is a forest of For Sale signs and an army of workers commuting from great distances.

At the bottom of every real estate ad I saw was the name of the same agent. One woman ruled the market, it seemed, and her name was Eleanor Farnsworth. I called her and threw myself on her mercy. She thought my problem over and then said, "I only know of one place that would work for you." She'd suggested it to Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie, she said, before selling them their more modest place in the French Quarter.

That shouldn't have been a selling point; it should have been a warning. I should have asked the price. Instead, I asked the address.

As soon as I saw it, I knew it—the mansion. The most conspicuously grand house in New Orleans. As a child, I'd ridden my bike past it two thousand times and always felt a tiny bit unnerved. It wasn't just *a* mansion; it seemed like the biggest mansion on the street with all the mansions, St. Charles Avenue, an object of fascination for the tourists on the clanging streetcars. But it was hard to imagine a human being standing beside it, much less living inside it, and as far as I could tell, none ever did. There was never any sign of life around it; it was just this awesome, silent pile of pale stone. The Frick Museum, but closed.

Inside, it was even more awesome than outside. It was as if the architect had set out to show just how much space he could persuade a rich man to waste. The entrance was a kind of ballroom, which gave way to a curved staircase, a replica of one in the palace of Versailles. The living room wasn't a kind of ballroom; it *was* a ballroom, with \$80,000 worth of gold on the ceiling. The bedrooms were the size of giant living rooms. The changing rooms and closets and bathrooms were the size of bedrooms. There were two of everything that the rest of the world has one of: two dining rooms, two full kitchens, two half kitchens. Ten bathrooms and seven bedrooms.

I didn't ask the price—I was renting—so I didn't know that the last time it changed hands it had sold for close to \$7 million, and was now valued at \$10 million. I imagined how it would feel to live in such a place. What it wouldn't feel like, clearly, was anything close to being in the other houses in which I'd lived.

Upper middle class—that's how I've always thought of myself. Upper middle class is the

class into which I was born, the class to which I was always told I belonged, and the class with which, until this moment, I'd never had a problem. Upper middle class is a sneaky designation, however. It's a way of saying "I'm well-off" without having to say "I'm rich," even if, by most standards, you are. Upper-middle-classness has allowed me to feel like I'm not only competing in the same financial league as most Americans—I'm winning! Playing in the middle class, I have enjoyed huge success.

In this house, I now glimpsed the problem with upper-middle-classness: it isn't really a class. It's a space between classes. The space may once have been bridgeable, but lately it's become a chasm. Middle-class people fantasize about travel upgrades; upper-class people can't imagine life without a jet. Middle-class people help their children with their homework so they'll have a chance of getting into Princeton; upper-class people <sup>(7)</sup>buy Princeton a new building. Middle-class people have homes; upper-class people have monuments. A man struggling to hold on to the illusion that he is upper middle class has become like a character in a cartoon earthquake: he looks down and sees his feet being dragged ever farther apart by a quickly widening fissure. His legs stretch, then splay, and finally he plunges into the abyss.

This house, and everything it represents, stands on the more appealing side of the chasm. "It's perfect," I said.

Every few days, I Googled the house and stared at it. Then a funny thing happened: it began to shrink. Sure it's big, I told myself, but houses come bigger. The White House, for instance. 妻と子供たちには、プールとみんながめいめいに持てるだけ十分な数のバスルームのある家を見つけたとだけ言った。 <sup>(7)</sup> Which is to say, they really had no idea what they were getting into. How could they? It didn't occur to them that not only would they have their own bathrooms, they'd need to decide before dinner which of the two dining rooms to eat in—and afterward, which of the three dishwashers to not put their dishes in. To believe it, and to grasp its full upper-class implications, they'd need to see it.

On the day we move in, we're all stuffed together in a rented, dirty, gold Hyundai Sonata. For fun, as I drive up and down St. Charles Avenue, I ask them to guess which of these improbably large houses is ours.

"That one?"

"No."

"That one!"

The exercise turns dizzy. Each house is bigger than the last. <sup>(x)</sup> The girls squeal in the back seat and press their noses against the windows, while their mother, in the front, does her best to remain calm. We pass in front of the mansion and they look right past it. The thing takes up an entire city block, and somehow they can't see it. It's too implausible. It's not a home. It's a



mint.

We circle around the block and approach from the rear, the Sonata rolling up the long driveway and coming to a stop beneath the grand stone porte-cochère. “*This* is our new house?” asks Quinn, age eight.

“This is our new house,” I say.

She begins to hyperventilate.

“Omigodomigodomigod!”

My small children plunge from the rental car into the driveway. They leap up and down as if they’ve just won an NBA championship. By the time we get inside, they’re gasping. They sprint off to inspect their new home.

“There’s another floor!”

“Daddy! There’s an elevator!”

My children love me. They have a house with an elevator.

(\*)

(出典 *The Best American Essays 2009* より)

## Notes

uproot: to move (someone) from their home or a familiar location.

turmoil: a state of confusion, excitement, or anxiety.

unnerve: to make (someone) lose courage or confidence.

awesome: inspiring awe.

The Frick Museum: ニューヨークにある有名な美術館.

fantasize: to indulge in fantasy.

fissure: a deep crack, especially in rock or earth.

splay: (especially of limbs or fingers) to be thrust or spread out and apart.

abyss: a deep empty hole in the ground.

Hyundai Sonata: 韓国現代社製ヒュンダイの乗用車.

squeal: to make a long loud high sound or cry.

implausible: difficult to believe and therefore unlikely to be true.

mint: a place where coins are officially made.

driveway: the hard area or road between your house and the street.

porte-cochère: a porch at the door of a building for sheltering persons entering and leaving carriages.

hyperventilate: to be or become overexcited.

NBA: National Basketball Association.

- (1) 下線部(ア)は、文脈から見て、どういうことを言っているのか、日本語で説明しなさい。
- (2) 下線部(イ)を和訳しなさい。
- (3) 下線部(ウ)を英訳しなさい。
- (4) 下線部(エ)は、具体的にどういう状況を述べているのか、文脈に沿って日本語で説明しなさい。
- (5) 下線部(オ)は、具体的には、どういうことが起こったことを述べているのか、日本語で説明しなさい。

**【訂正】**

冊子番号	科目	問題番号	内 容
05	英語	[I]	1 ページ 本文下から 5 行目  【誤】 ... or the <u>“the Clean Skies Act.”</u>  ↓  【正】 ... or <u>“the Clean Skies Act.”</u>  ↑ or の次の the を削除する。