

2020 年度 明治大学

【法 学 部】

解答時間 70分



配点 150点

る

## 英 語 問 題

はじめに、これを読みなさい。

1. この問題冊子は16ページある。ただし、ページ番号のない白紙はページ数に含まない。
2. 解答用紙に印刷されている受験番号が正しいかどうか、受験票と照合して確認すること。
3. 監督者の指示にしたがい、解答用紙の氏名欄に氏名を記入すること。
4. 解答は、すべて解答用紙の所定欄にマークするか、または記入すること。所定欄以外のところには何も記入しないこと。
5. 問題に指定された数より多くマークしないこと。
6. 解答は、必ず鉛筆またはシャープペンシル(いずれもHB・黒)で記入のこと。
7. 訂正する場合は、消しゴムできれいに消し、消しくずを残さないこと。
8. 解答用紙は、絶対に汚したり折り曲げたりしないこと。
9. 解答用紙はすべて回収する。持ち帰らず、必ず提出すること。ただし、この問題冊子は、必ず持ち帰ること。
10. 試験時間は70分である。
11. マークの記入例

良い例	悪い例
	





I 次の文章を読んで、以下の間に答えなさい。（\*の付いた語句については、文末に注があります。）

In 1930, the United States needed a miracle. Months before, the stock market had crashed, and the economy had begun to tank\*. As the Great Depression\* pummeled\* millions of American workers, Frances Perkins, New York's Commissioner of Labor, warned that New York faced a particular threat from a surprising group: Married women with jobs.

“The woman ‘pin-money worker’ who competes with the necessity worker is a menace to society, a selfish, shortsighted creature, who ought to be ashamed of herself,” Perkins said. “Until we have every woman in this community earning a living wage, I am not willing to encourage those who are under no economic necessities to compete with their charm and education, their superior advantages, against the working girl who has only her two hands.”

<sup>(7)</sup> Within two years, Perkins would go on to become Secretary of Labor in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's cabinet. And though she is known as one of the architects of the New Deal, her attitudes toward working women were shared by many who embraced the President's seemingly liberal economic policies of relief for unemployed workers.

Perkins wasn't the only one who married/of/suspicious/was/women in the workplace. The 1930s would see a spike in policies and laws that discriminated <sup>(1)</sup> (a)( ), even forbade, women to work when they were married. During the Great Depression, discrimination (a)( ) their employment even became law.

“Nine states had marriage work ban laws prior to the Depression,” writes historian Megan McDonald Way, “and by 1940, 26 states restricted married women's employment in state government jobs.” As women around the country ends/make/meet/to/struggled during the nation's deepest economic crisis, they <sup>(7)</sup> became an easy scapegoat for people looking for someone to blame.

By the time Perkins made her speech, the debate over working women — and

whether women should work once they married — had been raging for decades. Arguments about married women's work often centered on the idea of "pin money." Originally coined\* to refer to the small amounts of money women spent on fancy items, it had become shorthand for all women's work by the 20th century.

"The revised idea of pin money," writes Janice Traflet, "increasingly served as a justification for paying women (including working-class women) lower wages than men." Women's work, and their expenditures, were cast as inconsequential and foolish, Traflet writes, yet in competition with the ability of men to earn money to support their families.

Family support became more important than ever after the Stock Market Crash of 1929. Shortly after Perkins delivered her speech in 1930, U.S. unemployment hit a rate of 25 percent nationally — and the question of whether married women should hold jobs became even more controversial.

In fact, businesses had been banning married women from work since at least the 1880s. Marriage bars were designed (b)( ) ( ) to reserve employment opportunities for men, but also to ensure that unmarried women without families to support were kept in the lowest paying, least prestigious positions. Single women most commonly held clerical and teaching jobs, both of which had come to be seen as "women's work" by the 1930s. (Black women were subject to fewer marriage bars, but had little access to the jobs available to white, middle-class women at the time.)

In today's era of relatively strong workplace discrimination laws, the prevalence\* of marriage bars can seem astonishing. As Way notes, marriage bars were common throughout the insurance, publishing, and banking industries, and imposed with abandon\* by private firms in other white-collar professions. The laws and policies reflected common misconceptions about working women. It was assumed that women might work outside the home before marriage, but that they would want to return to the home sphere once they wed. Those middle-class married women who did seek employment during the Depression were often met

with hostility.

The arguments against married women working were personal. In Wisconsin, for example, lawmakers passed a resolution in 1935 stating that when married women with working husbands got jobs, they became the “calling card for disintegration of family life.” The committee added that “The large number of husbands and wives working for the state raises a serious moral question, as this committee feels that the practice of birth control is encouraged, and the selfishness that arises from the income of employment of husband and wife bids fair to\* break down civilization and a healthy atmosphere.”

In 1932, the federal government even got involved in marriage bars. Section 213 of the Economy Act of 1932 included a section that required the government to fire one member of each married couple working in government. Since women’s jobs inevitably paid less than men’s, they largely paid the price.

In order to prevent women from going by other names to sidestep losing their jobs, the federal government also began requiring women with federal jobs to use their husbands’ names in 1933. Some women even went as far as marrying men without federal jobs without telling anyone so that they wouldn’t be fired when their coworkers learned of their wedding. Though women’s groups and individual women who were banned from federal service rigorously protested the rule, it <sup>(x)</sup> would stay in place for the rest of the Great Depression.

Ironically, married women managed to make inroads into the labor market despite the discrimination they faced during the Great Depression. As historian Winifred D. Wandersee Bolin notes, the number of married women workers grew between 1920 and 1940. “The gains of the 1930s were not nearly as dramatic as those of earlier decades,” she wrote. “What is significant is that they were made at a time of great economic stagnation\* — at a time when women were a/deal/great/<sup>(y)</sup> pressure/public/of/under to leave the labor market in order to avoid competing with men for the short supply of jobs.”

注 tank : うまくいかなくなる      the Great Depression : 世界大恐慌  
pummel : (こぶしで)打つ      coin : 新語句などを造り出す  
prevalence : 普及, 流行      with abandon : 好き勝手に  
bid fair to : (物事が)~しそうである      stagnation : 不景気, 景気停滞

(問 1) 下線部(ア)(エ)(オ)の内容に最も近いものをそれぞれ1つ選び, その番号を解答欄にマークしなさい。

(ア) the working girl who has only her two hands

1. disadvantaged girls who have to work in order to live
2. girls who compete with charm and education
3. girls who are selfish
4. girls who are very good with their hands

(エ) it would stay in place

1. a women's group would continue protesting in some area
2. the federal services would last for a while
3. the Great Depression would continue in some areas
4. the marriage bar would continue to exist

(オ) managed to make inroads into

1. became enemies in
2. lost their status in
3. made some progress participating in
4. mostly did construction work in

(問 2) (a)(b)それぞれの空欄に入れるのに適切な英単語を記述解答欄に書きなさい。語数は各問の指示に従うこと。

(a) 英単語 1 語 (2 か所に同一の単語が入ります)

(b) 英単語 2 語

(問 3) 下線部(イ)(ウ)(キ)の単語を文の意味が通るように正しい語順に並べかえたとき、3 番目に来る単語を次から 1 つ選び、その番号を解答欄にマークしなさい。

(イ) married/of/suspicious/was/women

1. married
2. of
3. suspicious
4. women

(ウ) ends/make/meet/to/struggled

1. ends
2. make
3. struggled
4. to

(キ) a/deal/great/pressure/public/of/under

1. deal
2. great
3. public
4. under



(問 4) 本文の内容に基づいて、(A)～(G)の質問の答として最も適切なものをそれぞれ1つ選び、その番号を解答欄にマークしなさい。

(A) Which of the following is true regarding the state of women's employment up to 1940?

1. More than 20 states had limited women's access to state government jobs by 1940.
2. Most states introduced laws to ban unmarried women from working in 1939.
3. Once a woman got married, she was required to seek additional employment prior to 1940.
4. Women were encouraged to work for the government until 1939.

(B) In what sense were women "scapegoats"?

1. People just wanted someone to blame for falling living standards, so they targeted women unfairly.
2. There was no choice but to restrict women from taking on any kind of employment.
3. Women deserved to be blamed for the economic crisis, but they escaped criticism.
4. They were declared to be scapegoats by Frances Perkins.

(C) In what way was the idea of “pin-money” revised?

1. Although it used to be given to everyone equally, “pin-money” eventually stopped being provided to married women if their husband found a job.
2. In the old days, “pin-money” meant the income of working-class women, but the definition later expanded to include the salaries of all women.
3. “Pin-money” originally referred to the income that women spent on non-essential purchases, but it came to refer to female employment more generally.
4. “Pin-money” was traditionally seen as something shameful, but due to the economic crisis it became socially acceptable.

(D) Why was the idea of women holding a job even more controversial in 1930?

1. A strike against women’s employment took place in the stock exchange.
2. Frances Perkins delivered a petition to the government in support of female labor.
3. Men believed that women were inferior workers and refused to work with them.
4. As many as a quarter of all men and women who wanted a job had become unable to find one.

- (E) What was the effect of Section 213 of the Economy Act of 1932?
1. It allowed federal employees to marry each other if they both had jobs.
  2. It caused more married women to lose their jobs than married men.
  3. It helped people during the Great Depression.
  4. It guaranteed a minimum standard of living.
- (F) What was the intention of the federal government when it required its female workers to use their husbands' names in 1933?
1. To lessen the prejudice against female employees working under their maiden names.
  2. To make it easier for the police to know about the family backgrounds of the workers.
  3. To make sure no more than one member of a married couple could work for the government.
  4. To value the idea of traditional families.
- (G) Which of the following is true about Frances Perkins?
1. Frances Perkins was not promoted because she was a woman.
  2. Frances Perkins was one of the people who designed the New Deal.
  3. Frances Perkins was unsympathetic to unmarried female workers.
  4. Frances Perkins' idea was criticized in Roosevelt's cabinet.

(問 5) 下線部(カ) The gains が示す内容を15字以内の日本語で具体的に説明しなさい(句読点は1字と数える)。答えは記述解答欄に記入すること。

II 次の文章を読んで、以下の問に答えなさい。（\*の付いた語句については、文末に注があります。）

The greenest community in the United States isn't Portland, Oregon, or Boulder, Colorado, but New York City. To many people, including many New Yorkers, that idea seems perversely contrarian\*, but the evidence is straightforward.<sup>(7)</sup> New Yorkers, individually, use less energy in all forms than any other Americans, and they have the smallest carbon footprints\* (less than 30 percent of the U. S. average). Not coincidentally, they are also the country's only truly significant users of public transportation. New York metropolitan area accounts for nearly a third of all the public-transit passenger miles\* traveled in the United States, and the city itself contains half of all the country's subway stops.

In addition, New Yorkers are the last large U. S. population for whom walking is still a primary form of transportation. (In suburbia, when you spot people on foot they're almost always either moving between vehicles and buildings or trying to lose weight.) The United States today is so dependent on automobiles that the average household owns more than two vehicles, and more than a third of all households own three. (In South Dakota, nearly 13 percent of households own five or more.) In New York City, by contrast, 54 percent of all households don't own even one car—in Manhattan, the figure is 77 percent—and most of the families that do own a car don't drive it the way other Americans do.

The fundamental reason for New York's leadership in all these categories is the very thing that, to most Americans, makes the city look like an ecological nightmare: its extreme compactness. New York is, by far, the most densely populated U. S. city with more than twenty-seven thousand residents per square mile; Manhattan (which is the smallest of the city's five boroughs\* in land area) is even denser, with sixty-seven thousand people per square mile, or eight hundred times the average density of the country as a whole. Squeezing people close together may not look green—where are their solar panels, carbon-sequestering

trees\*, and backyard compost heaps\*? — but it actually reduces environmental impact, because it dramatically shrinks car ownership, makes efficient public transit possible, constrains energy use in all categories, and forces most residents to live in apartment buildings, which are among the world's most efficient residential structures.

High density living also sharply limits residents' opportunities for personal consumption and waste. New Yorkers don't have lawns, sprinkler systems, swimming pools, or rooms they seldom set foot in, and — because living space is tight and expensive — they don't accumulate large inventories of energy-sucking household appliances. The city's visitors (and New Yorkers themselves) often complain about garbage on the streets, but New Yorkers, individually, generate less solid waste than other Americans do: with less room for acquisitions, they acquire fewer things and, therefore, throw fewer things away. New Yorkers also use less water than other Americans do, because, with no lawns or swimming pools, they have fewer opportunities to use it.

Intelligently increasing population density — shortening the distance between people, and between people and their destinations — is the key to reducing a long list of negative environmental impacts in mobile, affluent populations. Worldwide, the prosperous communities that use the least energy and do the least damage to the environment are those in which, as in New York, living spaces are small, and per capita\* car use is very low — places like Hong Kong, Tokyo, and the older sections of European capitals (which have the significant environmental advantage of having been laid out before the invention of the automobile). Hong Kong contains one of the densest concentrations of people and wealth on the planet, yet the average resident uses only about a third as much energy as the average resident of the United States. Intelligent density is the reason.

Such arguments run counter to much conventional thinking about low-impact living. In 2007, *Forbes*\* assessed the environmental profiles of the fifty U. S. states and picked Vermont as the greenest. It's true that Vermont has an abundance of

trees, farms, compost, and environmentally aware citizens, and it has no crowded expressways or big, dirty cities. (The population of the state's largest city, Burlington, is just under forty thousand.) Vermont also ranks high in almost all the categories on which *Forbes* based its analysis, such as the proportion of LEED-certified buildings\* and the implementation of public policies that encourage energy efficiency.

But *Forbes's* analysis was misconceived\*, because Vermont actually sets a poor environmental example. In the categories that matter the most, Vermont ranks very low. It has no significant public transit (other than its school bus routes), and, because its population is so dispersed, it's one of the most heavily automobile-dependent states in the country. A typical Vermonter consumes 545 gallons of gasoline per year — almost a hundred gallons more than the average American and six times as much as the average Manhattanite. (Among the fifty states, Vermont ranks fourth highest in per capita expenditure on gasoline, while New York State, entirely because of New York City, ranks last.) Spreading people thinly across the countryside, Vermont style, may make them feel green — and look green to *Forbes* — but it actually increases the damage they do to the environment while also making that damage harder to detect and undo.

An easy way to see that is to imagine dismantling New York City and dispersing its 8.4 million residents across the countryside at the population density of Vermont. To do that, you'd need living space equal to the combined land area of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and Vermont itself — and then you'd have to find places to put all the people you were displacing, as well as providing them with the vast, redundant infrastructure of suburban sprawl: the roads and sewers and power lines and gas stations and hospitals and shopping malls and outlet stores and schools and parking lots and everything else.

Conversely, the combined population of Alaska and Montana — two states that, between them, contain a fifth of all the land area of the United States — is only

slightly larger than the population of Manhattan. And Wyoming and North Dakota, which are No. 1 and No. 4 among the fifty states in terms of highest energy consumption per resident, have, between them, a population smaller than the Bronx. These demographic facts suggest the possibility of a troublesome political divide, in terms of legislative approaches to energy and climate issues: the four high-consumption states just mentioned are represented by a total of eight U. S. senators, while Manhattan and the Bronx, with the same population but a fraction of the carbon footprint, share less than a third of one.

- 注 contrarian : 通説に逆らっている      carbon footprints : 二酸化炭素の排出量  
passenger miles : 旅客輸送量  
five boroughs : ニューヨーク市を構成する5つの行政区 (Manhattan, The Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island)  
carbon-sequestering trees : 二酸化炭素を封じ込める木々  
compost heaps : 生ゴミを処理した堆肥  
per capita : 一人あたりの      *Forbes*: アメリカの経済誌  
LEED-certified buildings : エネルギー面と環境面で良い設計だと認められた建物  
misconceived : 見当違いの, 的外れな

(問 1) 下線部(ア)(エ)(カ)の内容に最も近いものをそれぞれ1つ選び, その番号を解答欄にマークしなさい。

- (ア) straightforward
1. clear and undeniable
  2. encouraging honest discussions
  3. incorrect and ambiguous
  4. overlooked

(エ) the greenest

1. the most influential person in terms of natural conservation
2. the state least offensive to the environment
3. the state with the largest areas of untouched wild forest
4. the youngest community with a short and peaceful history

(カ) legislative approaches to

1. appealing to mass media for resolving such social problems as
2. direct actions by local residents for dealing with
3. dismissing difficult political problems such as
4. taking measures through laws and regulations for

(問 2) 以下の(A)~(E)について、本文の内容に最も近いものをそれぞれ1つ選び、その番号を解答欄にマークしなさい。

- (A)
1. The author believes that New York City is the least environmentally efficient community in the United States.
  2. The average carbon footprint of New Yorkers is under 30 percent of that of the average American.
  3. The public transportation systems in the U.S. as a whole cover nearly thirty times more miles than those in New York City.
  4. The total number of subway stations in the United States is triple that of the New York metropolitan area.
- (B)
1. In suburbia people rarely walk because it is dangerous.
  2. Most people in suburbia walk more often than city dwellers.
  3. New Yorkers often go on foot as a means of transportation.
  4. New Yorkers walk a lot to stay slim and fit.



- (C)
1. More than half of all households in the U. S. own three cars.
  2. New Yorkers seem to use cars less often than other Americans.
  3. Seventy-seven percent of Manhattanites don't own a car because of their poverty.
  4. The average household in New York City has more than two cars.
- (D)
1. Negative environmental impacts are generated only by cities with a dense concentration of people.
  2. New York is a leading city in the environmental movement because it now encourages recycling garbage and planting trees.
  3. The population density of Manhattan is 800 times the average population density in America, and most of its residents have to live in apartments.
  4. The sophisticated lifestyle of New York City is far more likely to damage the environment than the lifestyle in the countryside.
- (E)
1. Both residents and visitors in New York City are prohibited from leaving garbage on the streets to keep the streets clean.
  2. Hong Kong, Tokyo, and some cities of Europe share the same characteristic of having complicated town layouts that make large-scale development impossible.
  3. Low car use, the key to reducing negative environmental impacts, can be realized by intelligently decreasing population density.
  4. The extreme compactness of New York City made luxurious houses with swimming pools and many spare rooms nearly impossible, which resulted in a less wasteful lifestyle.

(問 3) 下線部(イ)(ウ)(オ)に関する以下の英語の質問について、最も近い答をそれぞれ1つ選び、その番号を解答欄にマークしなさい。

(イ) What do many people imagine is the cause of an ecological nightmare in New York?

1. A high proportion of car ownership among the population.
2. A large amount of garbage.
3. The absence of a good public transportation system.
4. An excessively high population density.

(ウ) What does they acquire fewer things imply?

1. A lot of regulations of the city prevent New Yorkers from owning recreational equipment.
2. Installing solar panels is too costly for people living in New York City.
3. New Yorkers keep home appliances in their garages because their living space is tight.
4. People in New York City do not have many home appliances due to limitations of space.

(オ) What does Vermont style mean?

1. Earnest and hardworking.
2. Immensely crowded.
3. Modest and conservative.
4. Sparsely populated.

(問 4) 次の英文の中から、本文の主旨に最も近いものを1つ選び、その番号を解答欄にマークしなさい。

1. When people live in compact spaces as they do in New York City, they consume and waste less, care for their neighbors more, clean the streets more thoroughly and plan for a better environment.
2. Population density may solve many environmental problems by reducing automobile usage, though it can cause other issues such as unequal economic development by concentrating people and wealth in large cities.
3. In sparsely populated suburbs and countryside of the U.S., poor people depend so heavily on public transportation that it often becomes a political issue whether or not to maintain significant community transit services such as school buses.
4. It is unfair that the four large states of Alaska, Montana, Wyoming and North Dakota hardly have the voice of their residents reflected in the U.S. Congress on the matter of energy and climate issues.
5. High density living in big cities can be more energy-efficient and less damaging to the environment than what is conventionally thought of as low-impact living.









