

I. 次の文章に関して、空所補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[1]から[20]の空欄を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を 1 から 3 の中から選び、その番号を解答欄(1)から(20)にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[21]から[30]の設問には、1 から 4 の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容から見て最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄(21)から(30)にマークしなさい。

The twentieth century was a time of exponential scientific and technical advance and the spread of democracy and human rights throughout the world. It was also a dark and savage age of world wars, genocide, and totalitarian ideologies. While [1](1. combined 2. coupled 3. preoccupied) with all this tumult, humanity managed collaterally to damage the natural environment and draw down the nonrenewable resources of the planet with abandon. We thereby accelerated the erasure of entire ecosystems and the extinction of thousands of species.

As a new century begins, we have begun to awaken from this delirium. Now we may be ready to settle down before we wreck the planet. It is time to [2](1. modify 2. calculate 3. adjust) what it will take to provide a sustainable life for everyone into the indefinite future. The question of the century is: How best can we shift to a culture of permanence, both for ourselves and for the biosphere that sustains us?

Consider that with the global population past six billion and on its way to eight billion or more by mid-century, per-capita fresh water and arable land are descending to levels that resource experts agree are [3](1. reasonable 2. risky 3. debatable). The ecological footprint — the average amount of productive land and shallow sea appropriated by each person for food, water, housing, energy, transportation, commerce, and waste absorption — is about one hectare in developing nations but about 9.6 hectares in the United States. The footprint for the total human population is 2.1 hectares. For every person in the world to reach present U.S. levels of consumption with existing technology would [4](1. substitute 2. eliminate 3. require) four more planet Earths. At the same time *Homo sapiens* has become a geophysical force, the first species in the history of the planet to attain that dubious distinction. We have driven atmospheric carbon dioxide to the highest levels in at least two hundred thousand years and contributed to a global warming that will ultimately be bad news everywhere.

In short, we have entered the Century of the Environment, in which the immediate future is conceived of as a bottleneck. Science and technology, combined with a lack of self-understanding and obstinacy, brought us to where we are today. Now science and technology, combined with foresight and moral courage, must see us

[5](1. through 2. over 3. beyond) the bottleneck and out.

"Wait! Hold on there just one minute!" That is the voice of the economist.

In spite of two centuries of doomsaying, humanity is enjoying [6](1. unperturbed 2. unperceived 3. unprecedented) prosperity. There are environmental problems, but they can be solved. Think of them as the detritus of progress, to be cleared away. The global economic picture is favorable. The GNPs of the industrial countries continue to rise. Since 1950 per-capita income has risen continuously. Even though the world population has increased at an explosive 1.8 percent each year during the same period, cereal production, the source of more than half the food calories of the poorer nations, has more than kept [7](1. pace 2. face 3. race), rising from 275 kilograms per head in the early 1950s to 370 kilograms by the 1980s.

For two centuries the specter of Malthus* troubled the dreams of futurists. By rising exponentially, the doomsayers claimed, population must outstrip the limited resources of the world and bring about famine, chaos, and war. On occasion this scenario did [8](1. unfold 2. display 3. appeal) locally. But that has been more the result of political mismanagement than Malthusian theory. Human ingenuity has always found a way to [9](1. accelerate 2. accommodate 3. encourage) rising populations and allow most to prosper.

Genius and effort have transformed the environment to the benefit of human life. We have turned a wild and [10](1. inevitable 2. negligible 3. inhospitable) world into a garden. Human dominance is Earth's destiny. The harmful perturbations we have caused can be [11](1. modernized 2. mobilized 3. moderated) and reversed as we go along.

The environmentalist has a different worldview.

Yes, it's true that the human condition has improved dramatically in many ways. But you've painted only half the [12](1. picture 2. view 3. perspective). As your worldview implies, humanity has learned how to create an economy-driven paradise. Yes again — but only on an infinitely large and malleable planet. It should be obvious to you that Earth is finite and its environment increasingly brittle. No one should look to GNPs and corporate annual reports for a competent [13](1. project 2. projection 3. provider) of the world's long-term economic future. To the information there, if we are to understand the real world, must be added the research reports of

natural-resource specialists.

They argue that we can [14](1. any longer 2. no longer 3. no less) afford to ignore the dependency of the economy on the environmental resource base. It is the *content* of economic growth, with natural resources factored in, that counts in the long term. A country that levels its forests, drains its aquifers, and washes its topsoil downriver without measuring the cost is a country traveling blind. It faces a [15](1. shaky 2. crispy 3. transparent) economic future.

By presenting these two polar views of the economic future, we don't wish to imply the existence of two cultures with distinct ethos. All who care about both the economy and environment are members of the same culture. The two debaters differ in the factors they take into account in [16](1. foreshadowing 2. foregrounding 3. forecasting) the state of the world, how far they look into the future, and how much they care about nonhuman life. Most economists today recognize very well that the world has limits and the human population cannot afford to grow much larger. They know that humanity is destroying biodiversity. They just don't like to spend a lot of time thinking about it.

The environmentalist view, or environmentalism, is fortunately spreading. The essence of this view has been defined in the following way. Earth, unlike the other solar planets, is not in physical equilibrium. It depends on its living shell to create the special conditions under which life is sustainable. The soil, water, and atmosphere of its surface have evolved over hundreds of millions of years to their present condition by activity of the biosphere, an extremely complex layer of living creatures. The biosphere creates our world anew every day and holds it in a unique physical disequilibrium. When we destroy ecosystems and extinguish species, we degrade the greatest heritage this planet has to offer and [17](1. hardly 2. conversely 3. thereby) threaten our own existence.

This is the essence of environmentalism. It is the guiding principle of those [18](1. bound 2. confined 3. devoted) to the health of the planet, but it is not yet a general worldview. The relative indifference to the environment springs from deep within human nature. The human brain evidently evolved to commit itself emotionally only to a small piece of geography, a limited band of kinsmen, and two or three generations into the future. Why do we think in this short-sighted way? The reason is simple: it is a hard-wired part of our heritage. For hundreds of millennia those who worked for short-term gain within a small circle of relatives and friends lived longer and left more offspring — even when their collective striving caused their

chiefdoms and empires to [19](1. crumble 2. grumble 3. trample) around them. The long view that might have saved their distant descendants required a vision and an extended altruism instinctively difficult to marshal.

The dilemma of environmental reasoning stems from this conflict between short-term and long-term values. To select values for the near future of one's own tribe or country is relatively easy. To select values for the distant future of the whole planet also is relatively easy — in theory [20](1. at best 2. at least 3. at most). To combine the two visions to create a universal environmental ethic is, on the other hand, very difficult. But combine them we must, because a universal environmental ethic is the only guide by which humanity and the rest of life can be safely conducted through the bottleneck into which our species has foolishly blundered.

*Notes: Malthus = Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834) An English economist who proposed a theory that the population tends to increase at a greater rate than its means of subsistence, resulting in war, famine, and epidemic.

—Adapted from Edward O. Wilson, *The Future of Life*. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc., 2002.

[21] In the 2nd paragraph of this article, the author mentions “a culture of permanence.” Which of the following best explains this concept?

1. It is a culture in which human beings coexist with one another in peace and harmony.
2. It is a culture in which all living things can enjoy longevity.
3. It is a culture in which we create values that will last permanently.
4. It is a culture in which we maintain sustainability for all living things.

[22] The size of the “ecological footprint” as mentioned in the 3rd paragraph

1. is generally greater in developing nations.
2. increases in proportion to the level of consumption.
3. increases as technological innovations advance further.
4. remains the same both in developing and developed nations.

[23] The author claims that *Homo sapiens* has become a geophysical force. Which of the following is most relevant to this claim?

1. The ecological footprint for the total human population is 2.1 hectares.
2. Since 1950 per-capita income for all human beings has risen continuously.
3. Human activity has emitted a great amount of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and contributed to global warming.
4. Human beings have succeeded in taking advantage of all kinds of natural resources that Earth has to offer.

[24] In this article, the image of “the bottleneck” is used to imply

1. the human population explosion that threatens the biosphere.
2. the continuing debate between economists and environmentalists.
3. a situation in which progress or development is slowed down.
4. a narrow escape hatch through which an escape attempt may be made.

[25] According to this article, which of the following best represents the economist’s position with regard to environmental problems?

1. Environmental problems can be solved if the GNPs of industrial countries continue to rise.
2. Economic prosperity should be taken into consideration first before talking about environmental problems.
3. Some of the environmental problems are so serious that we may not be able to find solutions in the immediate future.
4. There are indeed environmental problems, but that does not mean that we cannot cope with them.

[26] The economist in this article seems to believe that Malthusian theory

1. has not been proven by sufficient evidence.
2. has been proven beyond reasonable doubt.
3. has been applied both locally and globally.
4. has occasionally caused famine, chaos, and war.

[27] According to the environmentalist, the bright outlook for the future as depicted by the economist is an illusion because

1. it is not based upon GNPs and corporate annual reports.
2. no one knows for sure about the long-term economic future of the world.
3. the economist is just looking at wealthy industrial nations.
4. it is based upon a wrong assumption about Earth.

[28] According to the environmentalist's point of view, which of the following is true about the biosphere?

1. It is possible for us to keep Earth in physical equilibrium by preserving the biosphere.
2. The biosphere constantly interacts with Earth, creating a unique disequilibrium.
3. The biosphere plays a relatively minor role in creating the special conditions of Earth.
4. The geographical conditions of Earth accelerate the activity of the biosphere.

[29] According to the author, we tend to be rather indifferent to the environment because

1. economists have misled us into believing that environmental problems do not exist.
2. environmentalists have not put enough effort into raising our awareness about it.
3. the human brain has evolved in such a way that we tend to think in the short term.
4. we are egocentric by nature, which prevents us from thinking about the environment.

[30] According to the author, "a universal environmental ethic" as mentioned in the last paragraph is something that

1. you attain by resolving conflicts between short-term and long-term values.
2. you create by committing yourself to short-term values for the whole of humanity.
3. you gain by discarding the dilemma of environmental reasoning.
4. makes it possible for humanity to economically prosper in the future.

II. 次の文章に関して、空所補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[31]から[50]の空欄を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を1から3の中から選び、その番号を解答欄(31)から(50)にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[51]から[60]の設問には、1から4の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容からみて最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄(51)から(60)にマークしなさい。

About 500 years ago, the Renaissance scholar Erasmus of Rotterdam was deeply concerned with the manners of his students. He was worried because all of his life he had believed in communication through letters and books, conversation and teaching, and now his world had become divided on issues such as religion, governance and even scholarship — so divided that any discourse seemed impossible. At the beginning of his career, Erasmus had been a teacher at Cambridge and some of his most popular writings were textbooks concerned [31](1. for 2. about 3. with) using classical knowledge to train students to act correctly — with modesty, kindness and wisdom towards all in society, high and low. Thus, he wrote one more book, *On Teaching Civility for Children*, which he hoped might solve the problems that his society faced.

In this book, Erasmus set out to popularize the concept of “civilité.” Although often translated as politeness, Erasmus used the term to [32](1. create 2. devise 3. represent) an approach to life, a way of carrying one’s self, of speaking and relating to others that would enable all to live together harmoniously. Erasmus saw “civilité,” from which the modern word “civility” is descended, as the basis for civilization. Those who acted without concern for others were considered “un-civilized,” destructive barbarians. Civility, which is [33](1. far from 2. the same as 3. more than) simple politeness, is an important component of human society by which we show respect for each other. It is an old and nearly universal ethical imperative. In the ancient world, both Aristotle in classical Greece and Confucius in pre-imperial China held that a good man had to have good manners. However, concern with public civility is not simply an ancient tradition.

In 1997, the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Southern California published a study in which people were asked to [34](1. evaluate 2. explain 3. upgrade) the public civility of different groups in American society. The group that was rated the lowest on the scale of politeness was politicians. A congressional commission concluded that civility in debate had reached the lowest level [35] (1. by 2. around 3. since) 1935. Members of both parties, [36] (1. impressed by 2. repressed by 3. worried about) the effects of the report and their public image, held

a retreat in Hershey, Pennsylvania. The stated purpose of the retreat was: "To seek a greater degree of civility among members of the House of Representatives in order to foster an environment in which vigorous debate and mutual respect can coexist." This event illustrates that civility was, has been, and can again become an important social "tool" for interacting with others.

Yet, [37](1. all 2. not all 3. no) people are ready to accept civility. In fact, some members of Congress refused to participate in the civility retreat mentioned above. From both Republicans and Democrats, the same objection was raised — there is no need to be civil with those whose ideas we oppose. Indeed, honesty requires that we should not hide real disagreements under the [38] (1. cover 2. function 3. structure) of social manners. This was the argument of a much discussed essay by Benjamin DeMott entitled "Seduced by Civility." Published in *The Nation* in 1996, the article proposed that too much civility might [39] (1. deepen 2. mask 3. minimize) deep social conflict. The demand for society to conform to the rules of civility, said DeMott, is how people [40] (1. in 2. of 3. for) power avoid criticism. In other words, civility and its related concepts are a gross hypocrisy meant to further oppress the disenfranchised in our society. It is easy to "feel" the strength of this argument; after all, who has not felt like yelling at injustice or tearing down the walls of prejudice? This argument is not, however, borne out historically. It is, in fact, contradicted by recent social struggles.

Consider the mass protests of the American Civil Rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. The success of this movement is due in part to the genius of one of its leaders, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King's genius was in his ability to inspire the diverse people involved in the struggle to be civil and loving in their [41](1. dissent 2. company 3. brotherhood). This civil disobedience was the antithesis of hypocrisy; it was an example of civility as an act of high ethical principle. The Civil Rights movement did not seek to destroy American democracy; rather it sought to engage with American society, and to have it [42] (1. fulfilling 2. fulfill 3. fulfilled) its founding promise that "all are created equal." Dr. King understood that uncivil dialog cannot serve a democratic function. While it is true that democracy demands open dialog, and that dialog arises from [43] (1. disagreement 2. mutual understanding 3. respectful attitudes), it must be possible to be partisan without being actively uncivil. It is this concept that gave the Civil Rights movement its moral strength — that the means of persuasion as well as the goal of an argument were equally important. Deriving from earlier thinkers like Thoreau and Ghandi, the civil rights protesters were trained to remain civil and nonviolent in the face of a repressive, and often violent, system of

segregation. Again, Dr. King understood that the struggle for civil rights was not simply a movement to [44] (1. benefit 2. fight with 3. flatter) African-Americans, but an opening for a national dialog on the issue of “justice for all.” By behaving better, more civilly, than their opponents, protestors sought not to defeat their opposition, but to convert them to their point of view. Uncivil and violent protest, [45] (1. when 2. however 3. since) “justified,” might have broken the connections that bind America’s heterogeneous population into a united community.

From this experience we can not only observe the fallacy of Mr. DeMott’s anti-civility argument, but we can also sense an important social implication of civility — that civil discourse makes for a civil society. Without a common sense of manners, we have no common [46] (1. property 2. link 3. factor). Civility acts as a tie that binds us all together in a great democratic dialog. As the historian Arthur Schlesinger observed, civility acts as “a letter of introduction” to assure strangers that despite apparent differences of ethnicity, belief or socio-economic status, we are one community linked by shared practices of politeness and a belief in civility as a code of conduct.

We began this essay by looking at a 500-year-old call for a more civil society, for a world in which respect for one another [47] (1. outweighs 2. effaces 3. contrasts) any differences in opinion or belief. But do we behave any better today than the violent barbarians of Erasmus’ day? We squabble over our rights, and ignore our obligations. We believe the function of government is to give us the things we desire, prosperity, peace and progress, but we fail to volunteer for those non-governmental organizations, from hospitals to museums, that make civil society function. We rarely [48] (1. fail 2. wish 3. bother) to follow our own codes of civil behavior even when they are clearly posted on trains, buses or planes. We seem to be indulging in a collective act of [49] (1. forgetting 2. forging 3. restructuring) all of our manners and becoming the very barbarians Erasmus worried about. The problem lies in the process by which the values of the market, which are characterized by emphasis on getting what we want, have been [50] (1. allowed 2. conditioned 3. blocked) to move into the social life of our communities where we have traditionally engaged in a discourse to help us decide what we *should* want. However, it is not too late to rediscover civility, and thus preserve both our humanity and our civilization. The key to reconstructing civility lies in our learning anew the virtue of acting towards our neighbors with kindness and concern, and to value the means of our achievements as well as the ends of our desires.

—Based on Stephen L. Carter, *Civility*. New York: HarperCollins, 1998.

[51] The implication of the phrase “an old and nearly universal ethical imperative” as used in the 2nd paragraph is that

1. everybody everywhere should follow the same guidelines to good manners or else we will face chaos.
2. the idea of good manners is old-fashioned and should not be used as an universal imperative.
3. good manners are the best letter of introduction and it is imperative to have politeness to join high society.
4. a similar concept of manners as an ethical act towards society can be found in many cultures throughout history.

[52] In the 3rd paragraph, the example of the Congressional retreat is mentioned in order to illustrate

1. the need for politicians to be concerned about the public perception of their image.
2. the need to eliminate good manners in partisan political debate in order to facilitate governance.
3. the general lack of common civility in contemporary society.
4. the general lack of etiquette education in government circles.

[53] Which of the following statements is closest to the key concept of Benjamin DeMott’s article mentioned in the 4th paragraph?

1. Republicans and Democrats need to agree on better rules for polite debate.
2. Republicans and Democrats need to revive traditional manners for better governance.
3. Adherence to the code of civility helps social bonding by promoting kind manners toward the weak.
4. Adherence to the code of civility hides social problems by promoting manners above honesty.

[54] According to this article, which of the following was not one of Dr. King’s goals in his civil disobedience campaign?

1. To secure a special place in society for African-Americans through the use of better manners.
2. To secure that the founding promise of America, that all are created equal, is the birthright of all citizens.

3. To use civility as a “public relations” strategy, and convert a nation to his views on civil rights.
4. To use civility as a means of holding an ethical advantage over the opponents of desegregation.

[55] Which of the following statements best represents the main theme of this article?

1. Civility depends on courtesy which has been destroyed by partisan politics.
2. Civility is a key concept for the maintenance of civilized society.
3. Civility, etiquette and courtesy are the same – lose one, lose all.
4. Civility is useful because it offers an effective political strategy.

[56] Which of following people would the author of this article most likely not agree with?

1. The scholar Erasmus of Rotterdam, who felt that unless we teach students the rules of civility we will all become barbarians.
2. The historian Arthur Schlesinger, who wrote that civility acts as “a letter of introduction” to assure strangers that despite our differences we are one community linked by shared practices of politeness.
3. The philosopher Confucius, who believed that the ethically good man had to be a civil and polite man.
4. The writer Benjamin DeMott, who said that civility can act as a tool of oppression hiding social conflict under the cover of good manners.

[57] Which of the following is closest in meaning to the expression “civil discourse makes for a civil society” as used in the 6th paragraph?

1. Good manners will open doors that the best education cannot.
2. Civility costs nothing and buys everything.
3. It's nice to be important, but more important to be nice.
4. Consideration for others is the basis of a good life and a good society.

[58] In the last paragraph of this article, the contrast between the phrases “values of the market” and “the social life of our communities” is meant to illustrate that

1. socialism represents the only form of ethical governance.
2. capitalism cannot function in small communities.
3. free market consumerism represents the best source for determining our social values.

4. social values need to be considered from the perspective of personal duty, not desire.

[59] The word “discourse” in the last paragraph can best be replaced by

1. political debate.
2. public discussion.
3. ethical education.
4. moral dilemma.

[60] Which of the following would make the best title for this article?

1. The Heritage of the Civil Rights Movement
2. Manners and Civilization
3. What’s the Matter with Politicians Today?
4. The Importance of Tradition