

解答用紙A（マークシート）の記入に関する注意事項

[1] から [33] までの解答は、解答用紙A（マークシート）の解答欄にマークしなさい、

[例] (12) と表示のある問いに対して、「3」と解答する場合は、次の例のように解答欄(12)の ③ にマークしなさい。

(12)
①
②
③
④
⑤
⑥
⑦
⑧
⑨
⊖

なお、解答欄にある ⊖ はマイナス符号－を意味します。

I. 次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題があります。最も適切な選択肢を 1 ～ 3, 4 の中から選び、その番号をマークシートの解答欄にマークしなさい。尚、[6], [8], [11], [13], [14], [17], [21] の設問と選択肢、及び、本文の内容に関する [27], [28], [29] の設問と選択肢は、本文の後にあります。

The clothes that people wear are governed by codes that differ according to factors such as their culture, social status, and gender. In nineteenth-century Europe and America, for example, women of the middle class and above were expected to dress according to the dominant fashion not only when they were in formal situations, but when they were in the streets of cities, and when they visited other people's homes as well. Not only were they governed by complex rules about fashion, they were in some cases legally prohibited from wearing men's clothing. However, there were exceptions, and in certain public spaces women were able to challenge the existing rules by wearing alternative costumes. In particular, during the last three decades of the century, there was a dramatic increase in the number of places, such as schools, colleges, and

resorts, where women could escape the dominant dress code and discover alternative identities [1] (1. for 2. through 3. since 4. without) dress. These special places permitted experimentation in clothing style which gradually spread throughout society, changing attitudes to what respectable women could wear. Not surprisingly, American dress reformers of the 1850s attracted wide criticism when they wore skirts over trousers in the streets and proposed this costume for general wear. However, a very similar costume was accepted as an exercise uniform in schools and colleges, apparently [2] (1. because 2. why 3. so) it was not worn on city streets. New sports such as swimming and cycling that were introduced during the second half of the nineteenth century also provided a way of challenging traditional fashion rules. In fact, it could be argued that they produced a radical redefinition of fashion rules in public.

Until the twentieth century, sports and physical exercise as leisure activities for women were reserved almost [3] (1. exclusively 2. independently 3. usually) for the upper and upper-middle classes. [4] (1. Which 2. When 3. What) women wore while engaging in these sports depended largely upon the nature of the public spaces in which they were performed. When sports were performed near the home or in social clubs, conformity to middle-class standards of feminine dress was generally required. Tennis, croquet, ice-skating, and golf were perceived as social rather than sporting activities. [5] (1. Consequently 2. By contrast 3. Needlessly), women were expected to dress for these sports as they dressed for other social occasions: in the 1870s, for example, that meant long skirts, tight corsets, bustles*, and large hats. Competitive team sports were considered a [6] 'male preserve'. Women who played men's sports in public were considered vulgar and possibly immoral. Despite this taboo, however, when such sports were played in educational institutions or in the countryside, sports costumes were more [7] (1. surely 2. likely 3. considered 4. seeming) to include items of masculine clothing. At women's colleges, for example, students were permitted to play baseball. They could also wear uniforms which resembled those of male sportsmen. Naturally, such activities could only take place in private.

Riding was one of the earliest recreations in which upper-class women were able to engage. In the middle of the seventeenth century, women's [8] habit for riding, walking, and traveling featured an imitation of the coat then worn by men, including a similar tie at the neck, with a wig and a rounded hat on the head. Significantly, these masculine items of clothing were worn with full

skirts and other items of women's clothing. In fact, it is most striking how women's riding costumes [9] (1. became to 2. has become to 3. has come to 4. came to) resemble men's, with increasing numbers of masculine items included. This process reveals the extent to which gender boundaries in sports clothing had already become [10] (1. conservative 2. flexible 3. willful), long before the modern age.

Swimming was another activity in which upper- and upper-middle class women were permitted to try otherwise inappropriate clothes. Its popularity boomed in the middle of the nineteenth century, and large numbers of people flocked to the sea. Since swimming in ordinary clothes is impractical, it is not surprising that this new pastime caused a rethinking of dress codes. As a result, summer resorts quickly became fashion laboratories, where [11] the well-to-do could experiment with new styles of dress. In the 1860s, short trousers, which were not at all acceptable for women to wear in other public places, [12] (1. were adopting 2. adopted 3. have been adopted 4. were adopted) as bathing suits for women, and were worn with a belted jacket. One magazine article of the period described young women in this costume as "pretty boys". In other words, the gender boundaries of traditional dress codes had received a serious challenge.

However, it is important to note that different areas of the beach were subject to different dress codes. During the 1880s, on the beach itself women were expected to wear their regular clothes, including elegant hats, corsets, ankle-length skirts, and pointed shoes, together with a parasol. Magazine illustrations suggest that [13] most of them did. The sharp difference between land and sea was emphasized by the placing of wooden huts on wheels at the water's edge. Women entered the huts from the front, changed into bathing suits inside, and exited from the back, directly into the sea. Photographs from the 1900s reveal that women regularly showed bare legs when wading in the water, despite the norm that a skirt should always cover the ankles. [14] The sea itself was defined as a marginal space in which normal dress (and moral) standards did not apply. Thus, it is clear that modern leisure activities challenged the status quo of women's fashion and identity.

The impact of the bicycle on clothing in the 1890s can [15] (1. merely 2. hardly 3. nearly) be exaggerated. Cycling was a completely new activity which was never identified as a purely male pursuit. It was somewhat similar to swimming [16] (1. at 2. in 3. on 4. with) that it was virtually impossible

to perform in the fashionable clothing of the age. However, cycling was a much more public activity than swimming. It was difficult to do in private; it required space and public roads. The first female bicycle riders in England were [17] society women who were driven in carriages to London parks to ride. Yet parks, however quiet, are public places. It was therefore not surprising that what women wore during their cycle outings had a widespread impact on general attitudes to female clothing.

The most suitable clothes for bicycling were the divided skirt, which looked like a skirt but was actually a pair of trousers, or bloomers. Up until that time, bloomers had, for the most part, been worn with normal skirts. When some American women cyclists wore them without skirts, therefore, they were shouted at and scorned. The taboo against revealing their legs created a dilemma for women cyclists. One solution which they [18] (1. arrived at 2. laughed at 3. relieved at) by the end of the decade was shorter skirts. Women [19] (1. are already beginning 2. have already begun 3. had already begun) to wear shorter skirts at summer resorts in the 1880s, but the first women who wore such skirts in the city in the mid-1890s attracted hostile, shrieking crowds. Wherever women cycled, there was considerable resistance to [20] (1. so immoral 2. so an immoral 3. a such immoral 4. such an immoral) costume. In England, a few women cyclists wore bloomers; others wore a special type of skirt called the 'rational', which could be buttoned around each leg like trousers when riding. Members of the urban working class were particularly likely to greet the sight of women in this new 'rational' clothing with jeers, or even violence. The poorer the district, [21] the more contrary the people.

Curiously, in countries where women had participated relatively little in sports before the invention of the bicycle, the divided skirt for women cyclists was accepted very rapidly. For example, in 1892, only four years after the introduction of the bicycle, a top French official declared that the law against women wearing trousers should be [22] (1. toughened 2. relaxed 3. renewed 4. accepted) for bicycling only. A French department store began selling bicycling costumes with divided skirts or trousers concealed by skirts as early as 1893. Soon, most women cyclists either wore skirts over bloomers or divided skirts. The controversy over the use of these costumes was much less [23] (1. heated 2. literary 3. chilly 4. proper) than in England. The explanation for this may have been that in France the activity was adopted mostly by a relatively small number of upper-class women, as the machines were too

expensive for others. In Japan, on the other hand, a traditional divided skirt known as a *hakama* already existed; thus the introduction of cycling did not dictate that would-be Japanese women cyclists [24] (1. invented 2. had invented 3. invent 4. will invent) a new article of clothing. Of course, the appearance of female cyclists in *hakama*—traditionally a masculine item of clothing—challenged existing codes of dress. However, when women cyclists appeared on the streets of Yokohama in the 1900s, they were jeered at for being immoral, not for what they wore.

Not surprisingly, the bicycle became one of the symbols of women's liberation from nineteenth-century fashion rules. First, the two-wheeled vehicle's arrival definitively changed people's attitudes toward sports clothes for women. One [25] (1. can go so far to 2. could go so far as to 3. can go as far so to 4. could go far as to) claim that the appearance of the bicycle prompted the reconsideration of prohibitions against the wearing of trousers by women. In effect, it spelled the beginning of the end for Victorian fashion restrictions—corsets and bustles were also made impractical by the need to sit on the two-wheeler. Though some might argue that cycling [26] (1. brought back 2. brought about 3. brought up) the physical freedom of women, one look at women's clothing today will serve as a sharp reminder that women have yet to be freed altogether from the tyranny of fashion. Even those who wish to go against the tide of fashion find that an 'unfashionable' look is itself subject to rules and restrictions. Nonetheless, it should be clear that bicycling played an important part in hastening the rejection of Victorian dress codes.

*bustle : 昔のスカートの腰を膨らませるのに用いた枠や布など。

[6] What does the underlined expression at [6] mean?

1. an activity set aside for men only
2. an activity safe for men only
3. a place where men were protected

[8] What does the underlined word at [8] mean?

1. behavior
2. custom
3. clothing

[11] What does the underlined expression at [11] mean?

1. the healthy people
2. the affluent people
3. the skillful people
4. the polite people

[13] What does the underlined expression at [13] mean?

1. Most of the women were expected to wear regular clothes on the beach itself.
2. Most of the women wore regular clothes on the beach itself.
3. Most of the women expected themselves to wear regular clothes on the beach itself.

[14] Which of the following has a meaning closest to the sentence underlined at [14]?

1. The sea was a place without moral standards, where women showed their ankles. There was a small margin of difference between beach and sea.
2. The law of the jungle applied on beaches, and in their dressing cabins women were expected to behave less morally.
3. Dress codes for the water and for the beach were identical; moral codes differed, however.
4. Familiar urban fashion and moral codes were followed on the beach, but not while in the sea.

[17] What does the underlined expression at [17] mean?

1. women who work for organizations with shared interests
2. women who provide social services for people who need them
3. women who belong to the upper class of the social hierarchy

[21] What does the underlined phrase at [21] mean?

1. the people became less aggressive.
2. the people were increasingly wealthy.
3. the people became less tolerant.
4. people were increasingly opposite.

- [27] With which of the following would the author definitely disagree?
1. Public fashion never determined what people wore in their own homes.
 2. Off-street fashions were more conservative than those worn on the street.
 3. Women in the past were forbidden by law from wearing men's clothing.
 4. Sportswear for women began to resemble that of men in the 17th century.

- [28] During the nineteenth century, for which activity would the lady in this picture be most suitably dressed?

1. Horse riding
2. Playing sports in a ladies' college
3. Bathing in the sea
4. Bicycle riding



- [29] Which of the following would make the best title for this article?
1. The Evolution of Women's Sportswear
 2. Why Did Women Begin to Bicycle?
 3. Fashionable Women's Sports in the 19th Century
 4. The Birth of the Modern Bathing Suit

- II. 次の四つの文章は、脳と心の科学に関するフォーラムのテーマを説明した序文と三人の発表者の意見の一部を抜粋したものです。それぞれの文章を読んで、以下の質問に答えなさい。[A]から[I]の設問に対する答えとして、最も適切な選択肢を選び、その番号を解答用紙 B に記入しなさい。

With the arrival of twenty-first-century brain science, many people are re-thinking their ideas about personal responsibility. Free will has been at the center of philosophical debates since the 16th century. Today, however, science has made the key questions about free will even more controversial. Are our thoughts in some way determined by our physical brains? Is the free will we seem to experience just an illusion? And if free will does not in fact exist, must we change our ideas about personal responsibility for our actions? These are no longer just questions for philosophers. They are occupying people from all walks of life—judges, politicians, lawyers, doctors, and scientists. The following three opinions deal with the question of free will and individual responsibility.

Speaker 1

Science will never eliminate the idea of free will. Regardless of any other considerations, free will is an essential concept if we are to hold and value the idea of personal responsibility. All societies accept the idea of personal responsibility. We all make our own choices. Even alone on a desert island, one is always responsible for one's actions. The burden of proof, therefore, lies with those who would argue that free will is in fact an illusion we have created through ignorance.

However, few convincing proofs have been given so far. Those who refuse to accept free will believe we live in a world where every action, human and otherwise, is inevitable. Yet they are always unable to answer one simple question: if determinism is true, what exactly does the determining? Fate? That seems a vague answer. Predestination? Do the stars or our blood types determine our behavior and destiny? That explanation runs contrary to our experience. In the face of this difficulty, determinists have recruited science to their cause, claiming that genes are the key to our destiny. Stephen Jay Gould, by no means an advocate for genetic determinism, explained the theory by stating that "if we are programmed to be what we are by our genes, then our traits are unavoidable. We may, at best, guide them, but we cannot change them—either by will, education or culture."

True enough, some body processes seem to be largely determined by our genes. For example, if someone has the gene for Huntington's disease, he or she will almost certainly get the disease. But lawyers need not panic; clear cases of

genetic determinism are the exception, not the rule. Our courts of law already assign a strictly limited role to genetic explanations and data from neurological tests. Further change to the system should not be necessary.

Our brains are more than organic computers, programmed by genetic codes simply to respond to and act on a variety of stimuli. They house “us” — our personalities. All of our experiences, from our earliest years onwards, are recorded here, and those experiences continually shape us. Most actual decisions and actions result from a lengthy process of interaction with other people and within our selves. It is this process, as much as our genes, which helps our brains to make the millions of decisions that cause us to think and act. Genes might build our brains, but we are more than our brains; we are creatures with individual memories and experiences, creatures with free will.

Speaker 2

Everything which happens is inevitable. A causes B; C causes D; and together, B and D combine to cause E. Free will has no role to play whatsoever. My belief, called ‘determinism’, might seem inflexible, yet it is only an extension of ideas which most of us already accept. Most of us happily agree with scientific explanations when the question is about the physical world. We can accept a universe ruled by precise and ultimately understandable relationships between atomic and sub-atomic particles. No one disputes that two parts of hydrogen combine with one part of oxygen to make water. Yet that worldview implies that all chemical changes in our bodies are automatic. Since the brain is made up of chemicals, mental functions cannot be free. What we do in various circumstances is in no way chosen by “us”, but determined by our genes and chemical signals. These signals are influenced by food, air, smells, and other stimuli.

Research shows that brain chemistry is more important than the so-called conscious mind. In the 1980s, Dr Benjamin Libet measured brain activity during voluntary hand movements, and found that before the hand actually moved, much brain activity took place. In fact, the brains of Libet’s subjects seemed to be preparing for action before the thought itself occurred. Our brains, then, seem to make decisions unconsciously, before our minds become conscious of them. Free will is an illusion.

Do such experiments mean that we should radically reform our legal systems? Perhaps. At the very least, we clearly need to rethink the legal criteria by which innocence and guilt are determined. I do not reject the idea of personal responsibility, only the method of calculating it. In the determinist view, personal responsibility can only be the sum total of an individual’s

interaction with others and with his or her environment.

I do urge our society to take full note of what science is uncovering. Soon we will no longer require responsibility to be based on social customs and rules. Libet himself said that his experiments showed only that the brain provided a stimulus towards action. There is a short period of time, he claimed, when a person could exercise “free won’t”—that is, when a person may stop a course of action proposed by the brain. Nevertheless, Libet’s experiments suggest that free will is an illusion; the more we know about the workings of the brain, the more it seems that our brains are operating without our conscious intervention. Nonetheless, we continue to deceive ourselves and believe that we have free choice, because we simply do not have enough information about how decisions are actually made.

Speaker 3

Few areas of science today arouse as much controversy as cognitive neuroscience*. The reasons for this controversy are not difficult to understand. Over the last two decades, neuroscientists have been conducting various types of brain research. Their findings prove that certain specific changes in our brains cause changes in our mind; in other words, the evidence shows that the brain controls the mind. The implications of this research are potentially revolutionary. Knowing that many of the decisions we make are not “ours” at all—they have been made by our brains, long before we have thought to act—could result in far-reaching social changes. To give just one example, accused criminals in court might be able to use a whole new range of excuses. “My brain made me do it!” might soon be both the first and last defense offered in matters ranging from shoplifting to murder most foul.

Faced with this situation, a balanced approach is clearly desirable. Neuroscience, after all, is only one scientific field, and for the determinists’ position to be fully accepted, its findings would have to be made to harmonize with a great amount of research in many other fields, including psychiatry and a variety of social sciences. I strongly doubt, therefore, that science will ever provide a complete explanation for human behavior. On the other hand, neuroscientists can make many valid contributions to our understanding of how various behaviors can arise. Genetic variations can lead to personality changes, and there is evidence that certain brains are more aggressive than others. Through chemical imbalances, for example, brain function can become distorted, causing certain violent or criminal behaviors.

Neuroscience tells us that by the time any of us consciously experience something, the brain has already done its work. Yet should we abandon the

concept of personal responsibility? I don't think so. We need to distinguish between brains, minds, and personhood. People are free, and therefore they are responsible for their actions; brains are not responsible. There is absolutely no need, in my opinion, for us to change our existing legal systems in response to modern neuroscience.

Ultimately, our brains are like cars: they might come in a variety of models, but they are all mechanical, rule-governed devices. The interaction of cars is called traffic. The interaction of people is called society. However, the very idea of a society implies the existence of responsibilities shared by all of its members. Traffic only occurs when there is more than one car on the road. Similarly, our responsibilities spring from our interactions with other people. Put simply, personal responsibility only exists as a public concept. It exists in a group, not in an individual. If you were the only person on earth, there would be no need for personal responsibility. The fact that brains are genetically determined does not change the fact that people create and follow rules when they live together; nor does neuroscience eliminate the need for a concept of free will.

* cognitive neuroscience (認知神経科学) : 思考や記憶などの知覚、および、喜怒哀楽の感情を含むすべての心理作用を、神経系、特に脳内の化学反応との関係の中で研究しようとしている認知科学の一分野。

Questions

[A] Which one of the following statements best describes speaker 1's feelings about free will? Write the number of your answer in the box marked (A) on Answer Sheet B.

1. Although our experience argues that we are machines, controlled by our genes, we continue to believe in free will.
2. We need to eliminate the idea of free will, because it is an illusion created through ignorance.
3. Our brains are organic computers; because we are controlled by them, free will is an essential concept for humanity.
4. Although certain aspects of our lives are determined by genes, our experience justifies a continued belief in free will.

[B] According to speaker 1, why are determinists so eager to use genetic research to support their ideas? Write the number of your answer in the box marked (B) on Answer Sheet B.

1. Because until now determinists have failed to show exactly what is controlling our actions.
2. Because genetic research positively shows that our brains are actually controlling our every thought and action.
3. Because neuroscience, combined with other theories, proves that something unknowable is in fact controlling our actions.
4. Because fatalists and Professor Gould also determined that free will is an outdated concept.

[C] According to speaker 2, what did Benjamin Libet's experiments demonstrate? Write the number of your answer in the box marked (C) on Answer Sheet B.

1. Our brains are controlled by our genetic codes.
2. Our actions are determined by our desires.
3. Our actions are determined by our brains.
4. Our genes control both our brains and our thoughts.

[D] According to speaker 3, what might be one implication of recent neuroscientific research? Write the number of your answer in the box marked (D) on Answer Sheet B.

1. Both petty thieves and murderers might claim that they are not responsible for their behavior, because their brains are controlled by their morals.
2. Criminal minds will become easier to understand, since we will be able to see how their brains made them commit revolutionary acts.
3. Potential changes in society might result in criminals being blamed for their brains.
4. Legal arguments about criminal responsibility could revolve around the brains of defendants.

[E] According to speaker 3, why can our brains be compared to cars? Write the number of your answer in the box marked (E) on Answer Sheet B.

1. Because brains come in a variety of models; despite this, the idea of society implies social responsibility.
2. Because brains, like cars, come in several varieties. Many cars together create traffic, but the interaction of people creates responsibility.
3. Because cars are hard-wired, automatic machines, just like our brains; when we interact with models, we create personal responsibility.
4. Because our brains drive us as we drive cars, and we all take responsibility for traffic jams.

Which of the speakers would agree with the following statements [F], [G], [H] and [I]? Choose your answer from the list below and mark the appropriate number in the boxes marked (F), (G), (H) and (I) on Answer Sheet B.

Speaker 1 only: →	1
Speaker 2 only: →	2
Speaker 3 only: →	3
Speakers 1 & 2: →	4
Speakers 1 & 3: →	5
Speakers 2 & 3: →	6
Speakers 1, 2 & 3: →	7

[F] Science will eventually show that all human actions are determined in one way or another.

[G] Personal responsibility can only be understood by considering a person's interactions with others.

[H] Genetic factors clearly influence who we are and what we do.

[I] Legal systems should not be affected by the advances made by neuroscience.

Ⅲ. アフリカ南部諸国に於けるエイズ問題に対して、オーバル・ヒル・トラスト (The Oval Hill Trust : 以下 OHT) という新しい非政府組織 (NGO) が、2006年の秋にロンドンに設立されました。当組織の設立宣言によると、OHT の目標は、以下の通りです。

- ・エイズ患者への医薬品の提供
- ・HIVの感染拡大の予防
- ・広告による資金調達

あなたは、当組織の最高経営責任者 (CEO) という立場であり、2010年度までの予算計画を文書で提案する必要があります。

問題：「OHT のこれからの支出計画を英文で論理的に説明しなさい。」

- 注意事項： 1. 表や図ではなく、必ずパラグラフの形式で答えなさい。
2. 下の表は、貴方が計画書を作成するに当たって考慮すべき、支出に伴う結果をまとめたものです。従って、支出の欄に書いてあるのは「案」ではありません。
3. 長さは、100 語以上にしなさい。
4. 箇条書きではなく、接続詞や副詞を使って一貫性のあるパラグラフにまとめなさい。
5. 文法に注意して書きなさい。

支出	長所	短所
Large budget	More medicines More publicity	Funds exhausted soon Chance of corruption
Numerous projects	Wide geographical impact Broad range of solutions	Loss of focus Overworked staff
Many workers	Better management Better fundraising	High administrative costs Supervision problems

- 注 a) 支出：OHT は、現在、資本金として500万ドル (= 6 億円相当) を有し、年間25万ドル (= 3 千万円相当) の収入があります。支出としては、全額まで費やすことも可能です。
- b) プロジェクトの数：OHT は、現在までに、30もの資金援助要請を受けています。その規模は、100万ドルのものから1万ドルのものまで様々です。
- c) スタッフの人数：現在の OHT のスタッフは、貴方だけです。もしロンドンで新しいスタッフを採用するとなると、一人当たりの年収は、約4万ドルとなります。

平成19(2007)年度 経済学部 問題訂正

科目	誤	→	正
英語	P.2 2行目 [1]から[33]	→	[1]から[29]