

前期日程試験

平成 28 年度医学科入学試験問題

英 語

〔注意事項〕

- 1 監督者の指示があるまで、この冊子を開いてはいけない。
- 2 解答用紙に受験番号と氏名を必ず記入すること。
- 3 この問題冊子の本文は、17 ページからなっている。落丁、乱丁及び印刷不鮮明な箇所等があれば、手をあげて監督者に知らせなさい。
- 4 この問題冊子の白紙と余白は、適宜下書きに使用してもよい。
- 5 解答は、すべて別紙「解答用紙」の指定された場所に記入すること。
- 6 この問題冊子は持ち帰ること。

I

Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

If we reject the idea of a supernatural authority, we are faced simply with rules of our own making. Then the thought arises that the rules may be made in different ways by different people at different times; in which case, it seems to follow that there is no one truth. There are only the different truths of different communities. This is the idea of relativism. Relativism gets a very bad press from most moral philosophers. The 'freshman relativist' is a nightmare figure of introductory classes in ethics, rather like the village *atheist (but what's so good about village **theism?). Yet there is a very attractive side to relativism, which is its association with toleration of different ways of living. Nobody is comfortable now with the blanket colonial certainty⁽¹⁾ that just our way of doing things is right, and that other people need forcing into those ways. It is good that the nineteenth-century alliance between the missionary and the police has more or less vanished. A more pluralistic and relaxed appreciation of human diversity is often a welcome ***antidote to an embarrassing imperialism.

The classic statement occurs in Book III of *Histories* of the Greek historian Herodotus (from the fifth century BC), who is criticizing King Cambyses, a son of Cyrus of Persia, who showed insufficient respect for Persian laws:

Everything goes to make me certain that Cambyses was completely mad; otherwise he would not have gone in for mocking religion and tradition. If one were to order all mankind to choose the best set of rules in the world, each group would, after due consideration, choose its own customs; each group regards its own as being by far the best. So it is unlikely that anyone except a madman would laugh at such things.

There is plenty of other evidence to support the idea that this opinion of

one's own customs is universal, but here is one instance. During Darius's reign, he invited some Greeks to a conference, and asked them how much money it would take for them to be prepared to eat the corpses of their fathers; they replied that they would not do that for any amount of money. Next, Darius summoned some members of the Indian tribe known as Callatae, who eat their parents, and asked them in the presence of the Greeks, with an interpreter present so that they could understand what was being said, how much money it would take for them to be willing to cremate their fathers' corpses; they cried out in horror and told him not to say such appalling things. So these practices have become enshrined as customs just as they are, and I think Pindar was right to have said in his poem that custom is king of all.

There are two rather different elements here. One is that the law of custom is all that there is.⁽²⁾ The other is that the law of custom deserves such respect that only those who are raving mad will mock it. In our moral climate, many people find it easier to accept the first than the second. They suppose that if our standards of conduct are 'just ours', then that strips them of any real authority.⁽³⁾ We might equally well do things differently, and if we come to do so there is neither real gain nor real loss. What is just or right in the eyes of one people may not be so in the eyes of another, and neither side can claim real truth, unique truth, for its particular rules. Arguing about ethics is like arguing about the location of the end of the rainbow:⁽⁴⁾ something which is one thing from one point of view, and another from another. A different way of putting it would be that any particular set of standards is purely conventional, where the idea of convention implies that there are other equally proper ways of doing things, but that we just happen to have settled on one of them. As the philosopher says in Tom Stoppard's play *Jumpers*, 'Certainly a tribe which believes it confers honour on its elders by eating them is going to be viewed

with suspicion by another which prefers to buy them a little bungalow somewhere.' But he also goes on to point out that in each tribe *some* notion of honour, or some notion of what it is fitting to do, is at work.

Why does Herodotus show such scorn for Cambyses? It is conventional to drive on either the right or the left, since each is an equally good solution to the problem of deciding on which side we drive. Presumably, then, just *because* of that, a latter-day Cambyses who mocked our slavish obedience to the one rule or the other would be mad. Certainly, there exists here only the law of custom. But it is necessary for there to be *some* rule, and hence there is nothing at all to mock about whichever one we have hit upon.

In turn that suggests a limitation to the concept of relativism. For now there come into view norms or standards that are transcultural. In the United States and continental Europe they drive on the right and in Britain and Australia on the left, but in each country there has to be one rule, or chaos reigns and traffic grinds to a halt. Funerary practices certainly vary, as Darius showed, but perhaps in every community, ever since we stopped⁽⁵⁾ dragging our knuckles, there have been needs and emotions that require satisfying by *some* ritual of passing. If an airliner of any nationality goes down, the relatives and friends of the victims feel grief, and their grief is worse when there is no satisfactory 'closure' or suitably dignified way of identifying and burying those who are lost. In Sophocles' tragedy *Antigone* (441 BC) the heroine is torn between two unyielding demands: she must obey the king, who has forbidden burial to his dead opponents in battle, and she must bury her brother, who was among them. The second demand wins, and not only the ancient Greeks, but we today, understand why. The play translates. Antigone's sense of honour makes sense to us.

So we are faced with a distinction between the transcultural requirement 'We need some way of coping with death' and the local implementation 'This is the way we have hit upon'. This is what qualifies the relativism. If everybody

(6)

needs the rule that there should be some rule, that itself represents a universal standard. It can then be suggested that the core of ethics is universal in just this way. Every society that is recognizably human will need some institution of property (some distinction between 'mine' and 'yours'), some norm governing truth-telling, some conception of promise-giving, some standards restraining violence and killing. It will need some devices for regulating sexual expression, some sense of what is appropriate by way of treating strangers, or minorities, or children, or the aged, or the disabled. It will need some sense of how to distribute resources, and how to treat those who have none. In other words, across the whole spectrum of life, it will need some sense of what is expected and what is out of line. For human beings, there is no living without standards of living. This certainly suggests part of an answer to relativism, but by itself it only gets us so far. For there is no argument here that the standards have to be fundamentally the same. There might still be the 'different truths' of different peoples.

We can approach the idea of universality a different way, however, and a way that brings into focus what is for many a serious moral dilemma. We saw above that toleration is often a good, and we do well to put many imperialistic certainties behind us. When in Rome do as the Romans do — but what if the Romans go in for some rather nasty doings? We do not have to lift the lid very far to find societies whose norms allow the systematic mistreatment of many groups. There are slave-owning societies and caste societies, societies that tolerate widow-burning, or systematically deny education and other rights to women. There are societies where there is no freedom of political expression, or whose treatment of criminals cannot be thought of without a feeling of horror, or where distinctions of religion or language bring with them distinctions of legal and civil status.

< Notes >

*atheist = a person who believes that God does not exist.

**theism = belief in the existence of God or gods.

***antidote = anything that takes away the effects of something unpleasant.

(Adapted from: *Being Good: A short introduction to ethics*, by Simon Blackburn, 2001, Oxford University Press.)

QUESTIONS

1. Underlined 1: Choose the item which has the closest meaning to the underlined part. Write the LETTER of your answer.
 - (A) the firm contemporary notion.
 - (B) the old widespread attitude.
 - (C) the past democratic idea.
 - (D) the traditional noble concept.
 - (E) the aristocratic sweeping view.

2. Underlined 2: Translate the underlined part into Japanese.

3. Underlined 3: Translate the underlined part into Japanese by making it clear what “that” and “them” refer to.

4. Underlined 4: According to the author’s logic, explain in Japanese the reason(s) why the author says, “Arguing about ethics is like arguing about the location of the end of the rainbow.”

5. Underlined 5: Choose the item which has the closest meaning to the underlined part. Write the LETTER of your answer.
 - (A) abandoned killing each other.
 - (B) began killing each other.
 - (C) ceased being rational.
 - (D) quit being relativists.
 - (E) started walking upright.

6. Underlined 6: Explain the underlined part in Japanese by making it clear what “This” refers to.

7. Underlined 7: Find ONE WORD in the passage which has the equivalent meaning of the underlined part.
8. Underlined 8: Choose the item which has the closest meaning to the underlined part. Write the LETTER of your answer.
- (A) to begin to examine.
 - (B) to enable people to walk.
 - (C) to encourage people to go.
 - (D) to help think.
 - (E) to try to discuss.

II

Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

When the people of the small mountain town of Woodstock, New York, got their first dose of electrical lighting in late 1924, they were horrified. “Old ⁽¹⁾ people swore that reading or living by so fierce a light was impossible,” wrote the local historian Alf Evers. That much light invited comparisons. It was an advertisement for the new, the rich and the beautiful—a verdict against the old, the ordinary and the poor. As Christmas approached, a protest was staged on the village green to publicly condemn the evils of modern light.

⁽²⁾ Woodstock has always been a small place with a big mouth where cultural issues are concerned. But in this case the protest didn’t amount to much. Here, as elsewhere in early 20th-century America, the reluctance to embrace brighter nights was a brief and half-hearted affair.

The winter solstice, the longest night of the year, arrives on a date determined by where you live. But few of us will turn off the lights long enough to notice. There’s no getting away from the light. There are fluorescent lights and halogen lights, stadium lights, streetlights, stoplights, headlights and billboard lights. There are night lights to stand like guards in hallways, and the lit screens of cellphones to feed our addiction to information, even in the middle of the night. No wonder we have trouble sleeping. The lights are always on.

In the modern world, petroleum may drive our engines, but our consciousness is driven by light. And what it drives us to is excess in every conceivable form.

⁽³⁾ Beginning in the late 19th century, the availability of cheap, effective lighting extended the range of waking human consciousness, effectively adding more hours onto the day—for work, for entertainment, for discovery, for consumption—for every activity except sleep. Darkness was the only power that has ever put the human agenda on hold.

In centuries past, the hours of darkness were a time when no productive work could be done. Which is to say, at night the human impulse to remake

the world in our own image — so that it served us, so that we could almost believe the world and its resources existed for us alone — was suspended. The night was the natural corrective to that most persistent of all illusions: that human progress is the reason for the world.

Advances in science, industry, medicine and nearly every other area of human enterprise resulted from the influx of light. The only casualty was darkness, a thing of seemingly little value. In times past people took to their beds at nightfall, but not merely to sleep. They touched one another, told stories, and, with so much night to work with, woke in the middle of it to a darkness so luxurious it teased visions from the mind and divine visitations ⁽⁴⁾ that helped to guide their course through life. Now that deeper darkness has turned against us. The hour of the wolf we call it — that predatory insomnia that makes billions for big pharmaceutical companies. It was once the hour of ⁽⁵⁾ God.

There is, of course, no need to fear the dark, much less prevail over it. Not that we could. Look up to the sky on a starry night, if you can find one, ⁽⁶⁾ and you will see that there is a lot of darkness in the universe. There is so much of it, in fact, that it simply has to be the foundation of all that is. Is it evil or indifferent? I don't think so. Our lives begin in the womb and end in the tomb. It's (7) on either side.

We've rolled back the night so far that soon we will come full circle and reach the dawn of the following day. And where will that leave us? In a world with no God and no wolf either — only unrelenting commerce and consumption, information and media and light. We need a rest from ourselves that only a night like the winter solstice can give us. And the earth, too, needs that rest. The only thing I can hope for is that, if we won't come to our senses and search for the darkness, on nights like these, the darkness will come looking for us.

(Adapted from: Opinion Review “Bring on the dark”. *The New York Times*.
Saturday-Sunday, December 20-21, 2014.)

QUESTIONS

1. Underlined 1: Answer the question by filling in the blank with ONE appropriate English word.

The author compares the first exposure to electrical lighting to the taking of _____.

2. Underlined 2: Woodstock is described as “a small place with a big mouth.” Complete the following sentence with English words in accordance with the passage.

This indicates that the citizens of this small town

_____.

3. Underlined 3: What does the underlined part mean? Write the LETTER of your answer which best completes the following sentence.

The use of electric light is said to have _____.

- (A) changed human behavior dramatically
- (B) decreased the human agenda
- (C) had a gentle influence on human habits
- (D) made us more spiritual
4. Underlined 4: Here the author speaks of visions being teased “from the mind” and of “divine visitations that helped to guide [humans] through life.” Who or what visits the mind in these “visitations”? Write your answer in English.
- _____

5. Underlined 5: Big pharmaceutical companies are said to have made great profits from darkness. In your own English words, explain how this was done.

6. Underlined 6: The reader is asked to “look up to the sky on a starry night, if you can find one.” Why does the author think that “a starry night” may be difficult to find? Write your answer in your own English words.

7. Blank 7: Taking the author’s logic into consideration, fill in the blank with ONE appropriate word which can be found in the passage.

8. Write the LETTER of your answer which best reproduces the author’s idea below.

The author seems to think that in modern America _____.

- (A) electric light is soothing society
 - (B) electrical lighting is inhibiting invention
 - (C) more light is needed during the night
 - (D) too much light is used during the night
9. For human well-being, which of the following does the author think is underappreciated? Write the LETTER of your answer.
- (A) Consumption.
 - (B) Darkness.
 - (C) Electricity.
 - (D) Information technology.

III

Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

The central thesis of Steven Pinker's new book, *Better Angels*, is that our era is less violent, less cruel, and more peaceful than any previous period of human existence. The decline in violence holds for violence in the family, between tribes and between states. People living now are less likely to meet a violent death or to suffer from violence or cruelty than was formerly the case in human history.

Dr. Pinker, a cognitive scientist, assumes that many of his readers will be skeptical of his claim, so he spends considerable time trying to support his theory. He begins with an analysis of the causes of death in different eras and peoples. Some studies are based on skeletons found at archaeological sites. By averaging their results, he suggests that 15 percent of prehistoric humans met a violent death at the hands of another person. Research into contemporary or recent hunter-gatherer societies yields a remarkably similar average, while another cluster of studies of pre-state societies has an even higher rate of violent death.

In contrast, among state societies, the most violent people appear to have been the Aztecs living in what is now Mexico, among whom only five percent of people were killed by others. In Europe, even during the bloodiest periods — the 17th century and the first half of the 20th — deaths in war were about three percent. The data justify the philosopher Thomas Hobbes's basic insight: without a state, life is likely to be "nasty, brutish, and short."

On the other hand, a state monopoly on the legitimate use of force reduces violence and makes everyone living under that monopoly better off than they would otherwise have been. Dr. Pinker calls this the "pacification process." It is not only deaths in war, but murder, too, that are declining over the long term. Even tribal peoples like the Semai of Malaysia or the Central Arctic Inuit are believed to be "gentle" but have murder rates that are, relative

to population, comparable with those of Detroit in the U.S.

Dr. Pinker sees this decline in violence as part of the “civilizing process.” During the period known as the Enlightenment in 17th- and 18th-century Europe and countries under European influence, another important change occurred. People began to object to forms of violence that had been taken for granted: slavery, physical torture, despotic rulers or dictators, and extreme forms of cruel punishment. Voices even began to be raised against cruelty to animals. He refers to this as the era of “humanitarian revolution.”

Against the background of Europe’s relatively peaceful period after 1815, the first half of the 20th century seems to be very violent indeed with its two World Wars. But in the 13th century, the brutal Mongol conquests caused the deaths of an estimated 40 million people, which was not so far from the 55 million who died in World War II. This was in a world with only one-seventh of the population of the mid-20th century, although the Mongol warriors had only battleaxes, rather than the technologically sophisticated weapons of World War II. Since 1945, we have seen a new phenomenon that the author terms the “long peace,” which has ultimately become a broader “new peace” since the end of the Cold War. Of course, the followers of our news media and their daily reports (and visual images) of horrible organized conflicts including civil wars, genocides, and terrorism have difficulty in believing Dr. Pinker’s theory. Yet, he has statistical support for it.

A further trend to account for the historical reduction in the rate of violence discussed by the author in his unconventional theory is the “rights revolution.” The objection to violence is now more generally accepted and has tended to become a matter of law. Violence against ethnic minorities, women, children, homosexuals, and animals is often criticized or regulated by state or local laws. He does not argue that these historical movements have achieved all their goals, but he reminds us of how far we have come in a relatively short time from the days when lynching black people was common in the South; a

husband could be shown spanking his wife for buying the wrong kind of coffee in an advertisement on television in the 1950s in the U.S.; and Dr. Pinker himself could torture a rat to death in his laboratory.

His claim in accounting for the historical reduction in violence is reason. He uses the remarkable finding of the philosopher James R. Flynn — that ever since I.Q. tests were first administered, the raw test scores achieved by those taking the test have been rising. As I.Q. tests do not necessarily measure vocabulary or mathematical ability but powers of abstract reasoning, one theory behind it would be that we live in a more symbol-rich environment. Dr. Pinker argues that our enhanced powers of reasoning give us the ability to detach ourselves from our immediate experience and from our personal perspective, and frame our ideas in more abstract, universal terms. This in turn leads to better moral commitments, including avoiding violence.

(Adapted from: Books — Weekend Arts “Is a smarter world a better world?”.
The *New York Times*. Saturday-Sunday, October 8-9, 2011.)

QUESTIONS

According to the content of the passage, write T for True, F for False or N for Not mentioned in the text for each statement. Answer a question with “N” only if the statement is either not present in the text or cannot be inferred from the information in the text.

1. Steven Pinker’s belief that violence has declined historically refers only to collective violence — that between states, tribes, or ethnic groups — rather than violence between family members.
2. By using evidence drawn primarily from individual diaries, letters, and personal accounts, the author suggests that 15 percent of pre-historic humans met violent death at the hands of another individual.
3. According to the author, it is unclear that the establishment of states has contributed to less violence.
4. The so-called “humanitarian revolution” that began in Europe glorified certain forms of social violence — slavery, physical torture, etc.
5. The decline in superstition and extreme religious belief has had a profound effect in reducing both individual and communal violence since World War II.
6. An enhanced respect for human rights — an opposition to violence inflicted upon ethnic minorities, women, children, and even animals — holds out hope for an additional reduction in individual and social violence.

7. The author believes that the ability to reason abstractly in an environment rich in symbols may lead to more universal moral commitments, resulting in less violence.

IV Read the following lines and answer the question in about 150 English words.

The world of the twenty-first century is confronting a number of both long-term and short-term problems. Identify a problem that you believe to be very serious, explain the reason(s) why it is more serious than many others, and describe how you, as an individual, could help to solve the problem.