

I 次の英文(A)と(B)を読み, それぞれの下線部の意味を日本語で表しなさい。

(A) As a beginning we should try to clarify our thinking by looking, in some historical depth, at the presuppositions that underlie modern technology and science. Science was traditionally aristocratic, speculative, intellectual in intent; technology was lower-class, empirical, action-oriented. The quite sudden fusion of these two, towards the middle of the nineteenth century, is surely related to the slightly prior and contemporary democratic revolutions which, by reducing social barriers, tended to assert a functional unity of brain and hand. Our ecological crisis is the product of an emerging, entirely novel, democratic culture. The issue is whether a democratized world can survive its own implications. Presumably we cannot unless we rethink our axioms.

(B) Did you ever think, when you held or looked at a beautiful pearl, that its origin was irritation? An oyster, in response to the irritating presence of sand within its shell, creates a thing of beauty. Not only is the conflict resolved but value is created. When we understand that conflict includes the potential for us to create beautiful pearls and contribute to the world and to ourselves, then we begin to open up our shells, less concerned about letting life in. Embracing conflict can become a joy when we know that irritation and frustration can lead to growth and fascination.

II 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えなさい。

Many people believe that nature's value cannot be put into dollars and cents. That is, they value the natural world for its own sake, regardless of what services or benefits it provides for humans. Yet this notion is fundamentally at odds with the economic system we've created. ①

We live in a world that is increasingly dominated by a global economy, (a) it is assumed that everything of value has a price tag attached. If something can't be quantified and sold, it is considered (b). The president of a forest company once told me "A tree has no value until it's cut down. Then it adds value to the economy."

So how do we reconcile our economy with ecology? The Earth provides us with essential natural services like air and water purification and climate stability, but these aren't part of our economy because we've always assumed such things are free. ②

But natural services are only free when the ecosystems that maintain them are healthy. Today, with our growing population and increasing demands on ecosystems, we're degrading them more and more. Unfortunately, remedial activities and products like air filters, bottled water, eye drops and other things we need to combat degraded services all add to the GDP, which economists call growth. (A) Something is terribly wrong with our economic system when poor environmental health and reduced quality of life are actually good for the economy! ③

But [on, tag, what, did, we, if, price, put, a] things like clean air and water? If we assigned a monetary value to natural systems and functions, would we be more inclined to conserve them? Yes, according to an international group of ecologists writing in the latest edition of the journal *Science*. ④

The group argues that humanity will continue to degrade natural systems until we realize that the costs to repair or replace them are enormous. So we must find a way to place a dollar value on all ecosystem assets — natural resources such as

fish or timber, life-support processes such as water purification and pollination, and life-enriching conditions like beauty and recreation.

Most of these assets, with the exception of natural resources, we already exploit but do not trade in the marketplace because they are difficult to price. But ^(B) this is changing. For example, this spring an Australian organization became the first conservation group to be listed on a stock exchange. The company buys and restores native wildlife and vegetation, (^(C)) earning income from tourism and wildlife sales.

In New York City, officials recently decided to buy land around watersheds and let the forest and soil organisms filter water instead of building a massive new filtration plant. Until recently, this potential to use natural services rather than technology to solve problems has been largely overlooked, even though natural approaches may provide greater benefits to communities such as lower costs, reduced flooding and soil erosion and aesthetic benefits.

In Canada, forests are primarily valued for the timber they provide. But this leads to conflicts. For instance, a recent report from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans found that logging roads in British Columbia continue to devastate fish-bearing streams, even though legislation is supposed to protect them. In fact, our forests provide many services, (^(d)) habitat for plants and animals, recreation and others that, if assigned a monetary value, could completely change the way we use them.

As just one species out of perhaps 15 million, the notion of assigning value to everything on Earth solely for its utility to humans may seem like an act of incredible arrogance. But the harsh reality of today's world is that money talks and economies are a central preoccupation. At the very least, assigning monetary value to ecosystem services may force us to take a hard look at all that nature provides. Maybe then we'll stop taking it for granted.
(C)

設問(1) 本文中の下線部①～⑤を他の語句で置き換えるとすれば、どれが最も適切か。それぞれ(イ)～(ニ)からひとつ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- ① (イ) in disagreement with (ロ) in favor of
(ハ) in accordance with (ニ) as important as
- ② (イ) adapt (ロ) console (ハ) harmonize (ニ) treat
- ③ (イ) practical (ロ) corrective (ハ) medical (ニ) intensive
- ④ (イ) disposed (ロ) opposed (ハ) imposed (ニ) composed
- ⑤ (イ) improve (ロ) achieve (ハ) venture (ニ) utilize

設問(2) 本文中の空所③～④に入る最も適切な語をそれぞれ(イ)～(ニ)からひとつ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- ③ (イ) which (ロ) where (ハ) if (ニ) when
- ④ (イ) superior (ロ) worthless (ハ) inferior (ニ) comprehensible
- ⑤ (イ) while (ロ) toward (ハ) without (ニ) unless
- ⑥ (イ) excluding (ロ) concluding (ハ) precluding (ニ) including

設問(3) 本文中の下線部(A)とほぼ同じ意味になる同じ段落中の語句を(イ)～(ニ)からひとつ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (イ) natural services (ロ) our growing population
(ハ) our economic system (ニ) poor environmental health

設問(4) 本文中の[]内の単語を、意味が通るように並べかえなさい。

設問(5) 本文中の下線部(B)の this は具体的にどういうことを表しているか。25字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(6) 本文中の下線部(C)の it が指すものを同じ段落から英語のまま抜き出しなさい。

設問(7) 本文の主張に最もよく合うものを、次の(イ)～(ホ)からひとつ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (イ) We must prevent the domination of a global economy at any cost because it is destructive to the environment.
- (ロ) One way to protect the environment is to treat nature from an economic viewpoint, although it is rather unfortunate to do so.
- (ハ) Ecology-related problems should be addressed even at the expense of our economic system.
- (ニ) Technology is always expected to solve ecological problems because it can provide better services to communities at lower costs.
- (ホ) Products such as air filters, bottled water, and eye drops are key factors to improve degraded ecosystems.

- Ⅲ 今日では、作業用、ペット型、人間型など、さまざまな種類のロボットが開発されているが、あなたは将来どのようなロボットにどんなことをしてもらいたいですか。70語程度の英語で述べなさい。

IV 次の日本文(A)と(B)の下線部の意味を英語で表しなさい。ただし、(B)では、文学部の志願者は(イ)を、文学部以外の学部の志願者は(ロ)を選んで解答しなさい。

(A) (すべての学部の志願者)

この数年間、私の心を大きく占めたのは、「時間の使い方」ということでした。人間の一生というけれど、結局それは「今」という時間の集積ではないか。充実した人生というのは、必ずしもその長さによるのではなく、密度の濃さにかかっているのではなからうか。そういったことにこだわったように思います。時間の使い方は、そのまま、生命の使い方なのだ、私という人生の質は、それを形成する時間の質にかかっていると気づいたのは、やはり自分が、“残された”時間を考える年齢に達したからなのかも知れません。

(B)

(イ) (文学部の志願者)

日本人はきれいな発音の英語に固執しすぎるが、世界には聞いても理解しがたい英語もある。だがそれでも立派に通じる。要は、話している内容に中身があるかどうかが大事なのだ。特に、会話が弾み、本当に複雑なことを伝えたいときには、いわゆる「英会話」の能力よりも正確に読み書きできる英語の能力の方が問われる。

(ロ) (文学部以外の学部の志願者)

子どもの頃のわたしは本を読むことは好きだったが、定められた勉強は嫌いだった。そのことを、とても苦にしていた。どうやらいまだに自分は子ども時代の強迫観念からのがれられずにいるらしい。そう考えると可笑しさがこみ上げ、それに誘われるように、長い間思い出すこともなかった子どもの頃の情景が次々に心によみがえってきた。そうした心象風景のひとつひとつは、不思議なくらいに書物の記憶と結びついている。