

以下の設問A), B)の中から一つ選んで, 問題文 I または II, あるいは両方をもとにして, 自分の意見を英語で論じなさい。注意点を良く読んでから書きましょう。

(2014年 慶應・経済 解答欄 250mm×25行)

A) Should the Japanese government take measures to reduce inequalities in society? Why or why not.

B) Should the Japanese government take measures to solve the problem of youth unemployment? Why or why not?

注意点:

- (1) 箇条書きは不可。
- (2) 問題文 I または II あるいは両方で言及されている見解やことから最低二つ引用して, 自分の意見をまとめること。
- (3) 自分の意見とは異なる見解にも言及すること。
- (4) 引用する際には, 下の例を参考にすること。

引用例:

- ・ In his 2007 article "Making Sense of Secrecy", S. Kaane claims, "Privacy is golden." However, I strongly disagree with that statement, because ...
- ・ I agree to a certain extent with Devon Suzuki, who argues, "Schools do not protect the rights of students enough." in the essay by S. M. A. Foane (2010).
- ・ According to Foane (2010, paragraph 7), many schools "do not have proper privacy policies yet." Although this argument ...

※この引用例を問題文 I または II からの引用と考えると訳がわからなくなる。これは自由英作文の出題傾向が大きく変化した2012年度の課題文(読解問題)からの引用である。したがって, この問題に初めて取り組む人は, 過去数年分の問題に目を通す必要があるだろう。それにしても200語はゆうに書ける解答スペースを考えると, 問題の総数が減少したとはいえ, 受験生にとっては相当に荷が重い。

なお, 問題文 I または II, あるいは両方をもとにして, という指定に対してわざわざ両方をもとにする必要はない。自分が書きやすいテーマ, 英文の長さや難易度を目安に選択すればよい。

II. Read the following article, and answer the questions as indicated.

"Youth Unemployment: Whose Responsibility?"

by Ivan O'Werke (2012)

① [Working out] how many people, especially young people, are out of work is not easy. However, figures suggest that last year in the developed countries 26 million young people between 15 and 24 had neither jobs, nor schools to attend. Moreover, the number of such jobless young people [seems to have grown] by 30% since 2007. The situation is severe: in the USA, youth unemployment has already reached 18%, whereas in Spain, it is now 50%. In developing countries, the World Bank has estimated that at least 260 million young people are in a similar desperate position. It is possible that over 300 million young people are without jobs worldwide.

② Why is this such a problem? There are several clear reasons [why] these figures cannot be ignored. First, the statistics show that when young people are jobless after high school, they usually experience more frequent periods out of work, and earn lower wages later in life. Even worse, they are more

likely to suffer from depression and a variety of other illnesses, or to turn to criminal activity. Today, many under 30 are already losing hope; they are often burdened with debts, live at home, and see little chance of meaningful employment. Only [affluent] parents can afford to prevent their children from falling into that trap.

③ How [we] should address this situation depends on [one's] point of view. Some say that improving education is the solution. Too many young people, it is argued, leave school with the wrong skills. If they had received a better education, then many more of them would find employment. However, few academic qualifications can guarantee a good job. Many young people with good grades and plenty of enthusiasm still cannot find work, even though they are quite capable.

④ Instead, we should encourage industry to invest in the young. Over the past two decades, corporations have reduced training programs for newly-hired employees. This was partly the result of globalization: many companies realized that they could boost profits quite readily by employing cheaper workers abroad, [effectively] investing in low-cost labor instead of technology or training. In addition, increased competition discouraged many companies from investing in workers who might later quit and join a competitor. Yet, most managers instinctively [follow] such short-sighted policies: without trusting their new employees, few companies will be able to find the right number of skilled workers in the future.

⑤ Simply leaving the problem of youth unemployment to be solved by private companies or by so-called market forces, however, will never provide fast enough relief. For, although it is rarely discussed, more than one generation of young people is at risk. Today's unemployed youth do not feel like full members of society. They cannot afford to own a house or an automobile, nor do they feel capable of supporting a family. Thus, they have less faith in society. Unless this situation is addressed by governments, these alienated youths are likely to pass on these negative attitudes to the next generation.

⑥ Governments have a duty to care for all their citizens, but the young ought to count the most, since they represent the future. So far, few governments have acted decisively on behalf of the young. Instead, politicians listen to the voices of a more politically active and wealthier class: the elderly. However, we must acknowledge that today's retirees have had exceptional good fortune. Generously paid throughout their working lives, and blessed with secure pensions and plentiful material possessions, they have never [faced difficult circumstances like those faced by youth today].

⑦ Today, this older generation is politically active, and keen to defend its interests. One clear indicator was the 2012 US election, when only 45% of those under 25 voted, as opposed to 70% of the elderly. In the name of fairness, however, we need to deprive the elderly of at least some of their wealth. This can be achieved most efficiently by direct taxation. The elderly use their political power to resist tax increases, but more taxes must be collected, for the benefit of wider society. One option is indirect taxation, for example incentives for the elderly to transfer wealth to their children. Another choice might be to eliminate tax exemptions for affluent older people. Both, though slow, might be sufficient. For without some tax reform, it is hard to see how indebted societies across the developed world will be able to invest

in a sustainable future for their young people.

⑧ These new taxes will fund much-needed government programs. Only governments can create jobs for the young on the scale required. New schools, new curricula and new job-training schemes would be a good start. Retraining schemes, such as training youth to care for the elderly, are not only badly needed for society, but might also help relieve the unemployment crisis. Governments should also encourage the young to work in agriculture, which has a rapidly aging labor force, or in IT and other specially-targeted industries. Nevertheless, direct job-creation programs, such as infrastructure projects, would be the single most effective strategy.

### 【B)解答例】

I agree with the idea that the Japanese government should take measures to solve the problem of youth unemployment. First, in the developed countries, young people who have neither jobs nor schools to attend has steadily increased. According to Ivan O'Werke (2012), the situation is severe, and the statistics show that young people jobless after high school usually experience more frequent periods out of work and earn lower wages later in life. They are more likely to suffer from depression and various other illnesses or to participate in criminal activity. Many under 30 are already losing hope.

Second, according to O'Werke, over the past two decades, corporations have given up training newly-hired employees. Many businesses have thought they can profit quite readily by employing cheaper workers abroad. However, most managers instinctively realize that such policies are short-sighted. While leading players are private companies, leaving these problems in their hands, or to so-called market forces, never brings fast relief. Ivan O'Werke claims, "Governments have a duty to care for all their citizens," especially "young people," who "represent the future of the nations."

Nevertheless, I have doubts about the author's thought that the gap between generations is a single actual reason for today's youth unemployment. Globalization inevitably results in the economic gap between nations and one nation's people. Thus, corporations boost their benefits. Meanwhile, only government can introduce progressive taxation or increase inheritance taxes. Therefore, the government must take the most of the responsibility for youth unemployment. (245 words)

\*government 「行政」 the government 「政府」

一見すると、いや良く見ても、大変な問題であることは間違いない。ただし与えられた article の内容を引用することはいっこうに構わないので、大いに借用しながら、自分の意見を述べていく体裁を採ればよいだろう。ただし筆者の主張には、世代格差というお馴染みの論調が根底にあり、そこにいわゆる成長戦略と公共投資を絡めた折衷的なものであり、私個人の考えとはかなり異なる。したがって、提示した解答例はあまり出来の良いものではないが、受験生の参考には十分なるだろう。

目下、トマ・ピケティの「21世紀の資本(論)」が、米国を中心に大ベストセラーになっている。解答例の結論はピケティの処方箋と重なるものであるが、これも私の真意ではない。市場至上主義のマネーゲームの病理は、すでに国際協調程度で解消できる域を越えているだろう。常に国家の内と外に周辺(貧困)を作り出して自己増殖していく資本の論理は、もはや制御不能なレベルに達していると言っても過言ではないかもしれない。米国がどう再生の道を歩むか、歩めるか、である。

## 【全訳】「若者の失業：誰の責任か」

① どれだけ多くの人々、特に若者が、失業しているかを[計算する]のは容易ではない。しかし、数字が示すところによると、昨年、先進諸国では、15歳から24歳までの若者2,600万人が仕事もしていないければ、学校にも通っていなかった。そのうえ、そうした職のない若者の数は、2007年以降、30%[増えていると思われる]。状況は深刻である。合衆国では若者の失業率はすでに18%に達していて、一方、スペインでは失業率は今や50%である。発展途上国では、世界銀行の見積りによると、少なくとも2億6千万人の若者が同様の絶望的な立場にある。世界中では、3億人以上の若者が職についていないと考えられる。

② なぜこのことがそれほど問題なのだろうか。こうした数字を無視できないいくつかの明確な理由がある。第一に、統計によると、若者が高校を卒業したあと無職だと、彼らはたいがい、さらに頻繁な失業の期間を経験するにとなり、その先の人生でより低い賃金しか稼げなくなる。さらに悪いことに、彼らはうつ病を始めとする様々な病気になったり、あるいは犯罪行為に走ったりする可能性が高くなる。今日では、30歳未満の多くの人々がすでに希望を失いかけている。彼らはしばしば借金に苦しんでいて、親の元で生活し、意義のある雇用の見込みはほとんどない。自分の子どもがそうした苦境[落とし穴]に陥るのを防ぐ経済的余裕があるのは[裕福な]親だけである。

③ [私たちが]こうした状況にどう取り組むべきかは、[人の]考え方による。教育を改善することが解決策だと言う人もいる。不適切な技能を身につけて学校を卒業する若者が多すぎる、という主張がなされている。もっと良い教育を受けていたら、もっとずっと多くの若者が仕事を見つけられるだろうというのだ。しかし、良い仕事を得る保証となる学歴[学力]はほとんどない。良い成績を修め、熱意に溢れる多くの若者が、たとえ非常に有能であったとしても、それでも仕事を見つけることが出来ないのだ。

④ そうではなく、私たちは産業界を、若者に投資するよう促すべきである。過去20年間に渡って、企業は新規採用者に対する教育プログラムを縮小してきた。これは、ひとつはグローバル化の結果である。つまり多くの企業が、より安い外国人労働者を雇い、技術や訓練ではなく安価な労働力に[効果的に]投資することで、ごく容易に利益を増やせることに気づいたためである。そのうえ、競争の拡大により、多くの企業が、後日、退職して競争相手の企業に入社するかもしれない労働者に投資する意欲を無くしてしまった。とはいえ、ほとんどの経営者は、このような近視眼的な方針に[従う]のは愚かであると直感的にわかっている。新しい社員を信頼することなしに、将来、適切な数の熟練労働者を見つけられる会社はほとんどないだろう。

⑤ しかし、若者の失業問題の解決を私企業やいわゆる市場の力に任せておくだけでは、迅速な救済は得られないだろう。なぜなら、めったに論じられないことであるが、一世代以上の若者が危険に晒されているからである。現在失業している若者たちは、自分が社会の完全な構成員であるようには感じていない。彼らは家や自動車を持つ余裕もなければ、家族を養うことができるとも思っていない。したがって、彼らは社会をあまり信頼していない。政府がこの状況に取り組まない限り、こうした疎外された若者たちは、そうした否定的な態度[考え方]を次の世代に伝えていく恐れがある。

⑥ 政府には国民全員を保護する義務があるが、若者たちは最も重視されるべきである。若者は未来を意味しているからだ。これまで、若者のために断固として行動した政府はほとんどない。それどころか、政治家は、もっと政治に対して能動的でより裕福な階層、つまり高齢者の声に耳を傾けている。しかし私たちは、現在退職している人たちは例外的な幸運に恵まれてきたことを認めなければならない。彼らは、就職してから退職するまでの間、気前よく給料を支払われ、確実な年金と豊富な所有物に恵まれてきたので、[今日若者が直面している状況のような困難な状況には直面した]ことがないのである。

⑦ 今日、こうした年配の世代が政治に対して能動的で、自分の利益を守ることに熱心である。このことを明確に示しているのが2012年の合衆国の選挙であり、この時、高齢者の投票率が70%であったのとは対照的に、25歳以下の年齢層の45%しか投票しなかった。しかし、公平性の名において、私たちは高齢者から、彼らの富の少なくとも一部は奪う必要がある。これは直接課税によって最も効果的に達成できる。高齢者たちは自らの政治的力を用いて増税に反対しているが、より広い社会の利益のためには、より多くの税金を徴収しなければならない。一つの選択肢は間接課税であり、たとえば、高齢者の子どもへの財産譲渡に対する報奨金である。もう一つの選択肢は、裕福な高齢者に対する税の控除を廃止することだろう。どちらの選択肢も、ゆるやかではあるが、効果はあるだろう。というのは、何らかの税改革がなければ、全ての先進国の中で、借金を抱えている社会が、若者にとって持続可能な未来に投資できるようになる方法を見いだすことは難しいからである。

⑧ こうした新しい税は、大いに必要とされている政府の計画に資金を提供することになるだろう。政府だけが、必要とされる規模で、若者のために雇用を創出することができる。新しい学校や新しいカリキュラムや新しい職業訓練計画は、適切な出発点となるだろう。再訓練計画、たとえば高齢者の介護をする若者の養成は、社会にとって大いに必要なだけでなく、また失業の危機を緩和するのに役立つだろう。政府はまた、労働力の高齢化が急速に進んでいる農業や、ITを始めとする対象特化型の産業で若者が働くよう促すべきである。それでもやはり、直接的な雇用創出計画、たとえばインフラ整備事業が、まさに最も有効な戦略であろう。

以下の設問A), B)の中から一つ選んで, 問題文I~IIIをもとにして, 自分の意見を英語で書きなさい。注意点を良く読んでから書くこと。(2015年)

A) Should the Japanese government introduce quotas for the number of women in government and business? Why, or why not?

B) Should the Japanese government encourage more foreigners to settle in Japan? Why, or why not?

注意点:

- (1) 箇条書きは不可。
- (2) 問題文I, IIまたはIIIで言及されている見解やことがらを最低一つ引用して, 自分の意見をまとめること。
- (3) 自分の意見とは異なる見解にも言及すること。
- (4) 引用する際には, 下の例を参考にすること。

引用例:

- ・ In her 2010 article "Against Zoos", Malls claims, "Nature is not ours to control." However, I strongly disagree with that statement, because ...
- ・ I agree to a certain extent with Devon Suzuki, who argues, "Schools do not protect the rights of students enough." in the essay by Foane (2010).
- ・ According to O'Werke (2010, paragraph 7), one option is indirect taxation, although this argument ...

III. Read the following article and answer the questions as indicated.

"Global Charity Begins at Home" by Bette Steyput (2013)

① In 2010, the German banker Thilo Sarrazin expressed the feelings of many in Europe, when he declared: "Multiculturalism is dead". Even today, many Europeans would agree. They have only negative feelings about sharing their towns with people who have different religions, different languages and different ideas about clothing, food, and music.

② Nevertheless, the case against current global migration patterns cannot rest on such feelings. Political ideas which spring from deep-seated racial prejudices [should] be unacceptable in the twenty-first century. Such ideas can also be short-sighted. When immigrants adapt to the society around them, today's headache [might] easily become tomorrow's comfort. Instead, we [need] to look beyond the naive rhetoric of racism and nationalism to see why rapid migration flows may threaten not just the stability of the host country, but global prosperity. [Arguments against global migration are best made without reference to race].

③ Global migration today is the result of the increased inequalities between rich and poor, combined with environmental destruction across the global South. People are moving in response to economic circumstances. These circumstances are largely determined by trade patterns. Since 1945, free trade, long advertised as a solution to poverty, has brought great wealth to many. However, many more have been left behind. Today, billions still live in conditions of severe poverty. Many are unemployed. Without the intervention of the United Nations, this pattern will continue, and things will get worse.

④ Environmental destruction has driven much migration. Slash-and-burn farming might by now be largely a thing of the past. Yet, whenever people exploit resources without considering the future, the likelihood of migration

increases. That has been the experience of Nauru. Encouraged by foreign corporations, the Nauruans allowed their tropical paradise to be destroyed for money. Today, with no other source of income available, they have turned their island into a temporary home for migrants attempting to reach Australia. Ironically, now that their natural resources have been used up, many Nauruans themselves may soon choose to leave. Obviously, Nauru's story cannot be repeated on a global scale, as there would be nowhere left to run.

⑤ Migration encourages a belief in temporary solutions. The rich and skilled in poor countries see the move abroad as a way out. Whether we are talking about IT specialists or doctors and nurses is irrelevant; poorly paid at home, they are usually welcomed by foreign governments. But if this results in profit for the host countries, the migrants' home countries clearly lose. And it is hard to believe that simply by sending money back home they will entirely cover that loss. Critics of immigration are usually wrong to claim that immigrants do not give back to the societies they adopt. Ironically, the reverse also occurs; they should, but often do not, help out the places from where they came.

⑥ Today, this has become a pressing issue, because better transportation and increased global communications have speeded up the process of migration. In the past, the pace of change was slow. Migrants shaped the Americas as we know them today over hundreds of years. Across Asia, population movements over many centuries have affected virtually every nation. Today's migrations, however, are more like tides; immigrants move rapidly into growing economies, but fail to adapt to them and are left on the margins of society. When the money runs dry, many will simply move on.

⑦ Critics of immigration as an economic cure are not always racially prejudiced. They often support measures to help immigrants gain citizenship and fairer treatment. Indeed, we should all make every effort to look after those who have made the long journey to a new land. Yet, mass immigration is not a solution, but is in fact part of a wider problem. It is easy for rich countries to accept skilled immigrants, and equally easy for poorer nations to allow unwanted minorities or unskilled manpower to leave. Yet both sides need to change course. Rich nations need to find fair and equitable ways to provide a future for all of their present inhabitants. Poor nations need to address the issue of population growth and economic inefficiency at home. The temporary solution of replacing people in aging societies with younger people from elsewhere is simply a dead end: both donors and recipients are on an unsustainable course.

### 【B)解答例1】

The Japanese government should not encourage more foreigners to settle in Japan. In her 2013 article, Bette Steyput says many Europeans "have only negative feelings about sharing their towns with people who have different religions, different languages and different ideas about clothing, food, and music." It is easy to deny this attitude as she does, but when arguing about foreign workers from the economic viewpoint, people forget we human beings are emotional, not reasonable; what motivates at least half of our actual behaviors is not reason but emotion. Bette Steyput argues, "Political ideas which spring from deep-seated racial prejudices should be unacceptable in the

twenty-first century.” However, in reality, accepting many foreign workers has developed racial prejudices even in the United State, a nation of immigrants. In Japan, a homogeneous island nation, the government should not run the risk of arousing aggressive nationalism even if receiving more foreigners has some economic rationality. As Bette Steyput argues, “Rich nations need to find fair and equitable ways to provide a future for all of their present inhabitants.” (175 words)

### 【B)解答例 2】

The Japanese government should not encourage more foreigners to settle in Japan. Some claim accepting more foreign workers is essential because Japan is suffering from shortages of working force due to the declining birthrate and the aging population. However, the main reason many businesses employ foreigners is that they can force them to work at lower wages than Japanese workers. Accordingly, they can keep Japanese employees working at low pay, which has made marriage and childbearing difficult and caused the birthrate to decline. Moreover, AI and robots can radically change or eliminate many human jobs, so the problem of labor shortage may well disappear.

While those countries from which foreign laborers migrate are under development at the moment, they will probably begin to develop with increasing speed not far from now. They are also highly likely to become aging societies before long. Therefore, welcoming more immigrants is only a short-sighted means to cope with a population decrease.

As Bette Steyput argues in her article (2013), “Political ideas which spring from deep-seated racial prejudices should be unacceptable in the twenty-first century.” Nevertheless, human beings are inherently [by nature] emotional and illogical, not reasonable. Otherwise, human history would not have been so full of bloody conflicts. In most developed countries, accepting many foreigners has aroused racism and anti-foreign sentiment. Also in Japan, aggressive nationalism is already gaining power. We should be most careful not to excite negative human emotions. (235-236 words)

移民労働者の受入れは、核軍縮と共に、世界にとっても日本にとっても最も重要な課題である。解答例の1は、引用を多用しながら自説を述べているが、ポイントを「偏狭なナショナリズム・民族的排外主義を喚起する危険性」に絞っている。なお、語数的にはこのくらいでも十分、あるいは十二分、だと思われる。ただし100語を割るのは避けたほうがよいだろう。解答例の2では、あえて引用を一つに絞って、本音に近い自分の意見を述べているが、メインポイントは解答例の1と同じである。

※注意点の(4)に引用例が示されている。入学後にレポートや論文を書く際の予行演習とも考えられるので、引用は参考例に反しないように注意したい。なお、2014年も含めて[解答例]の表記を一部変更した。(この項補足)

※書くべき内容と構成を考える際に日本語でメモ書きするのは構わない、というより必要なことかもしれないが、文全体を日本語で書いてから英語に訳すのは、最少語数で済ませる(つまり内容で勝負する)としても時間的に無理だろう。実際の試験で求められるのは「英語→日本語→英語」の力ではなく「英語→英語」の力である。問題文中の語彙をうまく借用しながら英語で書く力を身につけたい。英語力と同時に、諸々の社会経済問題に関する「関心と背景知識」が不可欠になる。(この項補足)



以下の設問(A), (B)の中から一つ選んで、問題文 I ~ III をもとにして、自分の意見を英語で書きなさい。注意点をよく読んでから書くこと。(2016年)

(A) Should the Japanese government legalize same-sex marriage? Why, or why not?

(B) Should the Japanese government require everyone to vote? Why, or why not?

注意点:

- (1) 箇条書きは不可。
- (2) 問題文 I, II または III で言及されている見解やことがらを最低一つ引用して、自分の意見をまとめること。
- (3) 自分の意見と異なる見解にも言及すること。
- (4) 引用する際には、下の例を参考にすること。

引用例:

- ・ In her 2010 article "Against Zoos", Faerrer claims, "Nature is not ours to control." However, I strongly disagree with that statement, because ...
- ・ I agree to a certain extent with Eve N. Suzuki who argues, "Schools do not protect the rights of students enough." in the essay by Foane (2010).
- ・ According to O'Werke (2012, paragraph 7), one option is indirect taxation. Although this argument ...

I. Read the following article and answer the questions as indicated.

"In Defense of Traditional Marriage" by Noah Reinbos (2014)

① Today, the vast majority of governments around the world do not allow couples of the same sex to marry. Why? Answering this is by no means easy. Our response should not be based on blind prejudice. Instead, we should reject such a critical change on economic, political and cultural grounds.

② The major religions of the world have long agreed that marriage should be between a man and a woman. As the Supreme Court of Minnesota in the USA found in 1971, "The definition of marriage as a union of man and woman, uniquely involving the raising of children within a family, is as old as the Bible." Other major religions also [proclaimed] that marriage is allowed only between a man and a woman. Thus, though some countries have very recently legalized homosexual marriage, other societies have an equal right not to, based on traditions going back thousands of years.

③ However, behind such religious arguments, which ultimately depend on the interpretation of sacred texts, lies practical economic wisdom. Heterosexual couples, by raising children, contribute to society. In recognition of this, most societies reward them with various benefits such as reduced taxation. Such marriage allowances are given by choice and society can choose not to give the same benefits to same-sex couples. How the state organizes itself and rewards its citizens are political questions, where the view of the majority must prevail. In other words, marriage is [economically too important to be left to religion].

④ In fact, wherever marriage benefits are offered more widely, people usually do not even bother to get married. Take Scandinavia, for example. Sweden began offering benefits to same-sex couples in 1987. Denmark followed in 1989 and

Norway in 1993. According to a 2004 report by Stanley Kurtz, PhD, from 1990 to 2000, the number of unmarried parents with children in Norway rose from 39% to 50% and Sweden's rose from 47% to 55%. Similarly, the out-of-wedlock birthrate in Denmark rose 25% during the 1990s, and approximately 60% of first born Danish children now have unmarried parents. As Kurtz concludes, "Marriage is slowly dying in Scandinavia." Promoting same-sex "marriages" [has undermined the institution of marriage in] Scandinavia.

⑤ Political considerations like these illustrate the vital link between marriage and children. The most important justification for marriage is that it allows couples to raise children in secure, stable families. Children need both a mother and a father. Should governments really adopt a measure which denies this? Several studies show that girls who are raised apart from their fathers are at higher risk for early sexual activity and teenage pregnancy; children without a mother are deprived of the emotional security and loving advice that mothers provide. Furthermore, research has [suggested] that children with lesbian or gay parents are more likely to engage in homosexual behavior themselves. Tasker and Golombok (1997) found that 25% of [sampled] young adults raised by lesbian mothers had engaged in a homosexual relationship, compared to 0% of those raised by heterosexual mothers. [legalized] same sex marriage will only encourage this trend.

⑥ At root, the idea of same-sex marriage presents a challenge to the traditional concept of marriage itself. Granting same-sex couples full legal status is the start of a slippery slope. As argued by Ryan T. Anderson, scholar at The Heritage Foundation, "In recent decades, marriage has been weakened by a radical view that makes adults' desires more important than children's needs... Redefining marriage to include same-sex relationships would be the logical result of this idea, and to do so [might leave] emotional intensity as the only thing that sets marriage apart from other bonds."

⑦ [Few] can dispute that such trends will accelerate if same-sex marriages become more common. Furthermore, it is likely that more children will grow up in unstable households. The broad social costs are simply too high, compared with the benefits of allowing individual members of same-sex couples to express their commitment publicly. This has been the experience of countries like the US. Although more than twenty US states currently allow same-sex couples to marry, the remaining thirty strongly oppose it.

⑧ No society should abandon its religious, social and moral traditions, however widely they are debated. The 21st century has witnessed an amazingly rapid change in how we view gender roles and political participation. Surely, as part of these changes we should consider reducing active discrimination against people based on their sexuality. That does not mean, however, that we should actively reward such minorities, by casting away ancient customs and ideas which have stood the test of time in most corners of the world.

II. Read the following article, and answer the questions as indicated.

"Following Ireland, for Better or for Worse" by Roy G. Biv (2015)

① Same-sex marriage is an idea [whose] time has come. The recent national referendum held in Ireland, where the citizens overwhelmingly voted "Yes", is one simple proof: if even a Catholic country can accept it, why should other, less religious countries ignore its many advantages?

② Clearly, same-sex marriage is a civil right. In the US, a 1967 Supreme Courtcase confirmed that marriage is "one of the basic civil rights of man," and same-sex marriages should receive the same protections given to interracial marriages by that decision. The NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), on May 19, 2012, declared same-sex marriage as "one of the key civil rights struggles of our time." [ 12 ]

③ Marriage has never been simply about one man and one woman. In most societies throughout history, couples have lived with many other relatives in an extended family. [Some] societies and religions permit a man to have many wives, [and] there are many instances of community-based child-rearing around the world. Looked at broadly, heterosexual monogamy can be considered "unnatural" in evolutionary terms. In fact, nothing is so narrow-minded as to assume that the modern family is the only way for people to be happy.

④ Extending the definition of marriage will not cause the end of the family. A 2009 study published in *Social Science Quarterly* found that "laws permitting same-sex marriage have no adverse effect on marriage, divorce, and abortion rates, or the percent of children born outside marriage." The American Anthropological Association (AAA) has also found "no support whatsoever for the view that civilization depends upon marriage as an exclusively heterosexual institution. Anthropological research supports the conclusion that a vast array of family types, including families built upon same-sex partnerships, can contribute to stable and humane societies." Legalizing gay marriage, therefore, will not harm heterosexual marriages or what right-wing politicians mistakenly call "family values".

⑤ In fact, the opposite may be true. Divorce rates even appear to be higher where gay marriage is banned. Massachusetts, which became the first state to legalize gay marriage in 2004, also had the lowest divorce rate in the country in 2010. Its divorce rate declined 21% between 2003 and 2010. Alaska, which altered its constitution to prohibit gay marriage in 1998, saw a 17.2% increase in its divorce rate. The seven US states with the highest divorce rates between 2005 and 2010 all had legal prohibitions against gay marriage.

⑥ Opponents of same-sex marriage usually [emphasize] the issue of children. Some argue that marriage is solely for the purpose of having and raising children. But if this is true, how should we treat those male-female couples who do not have children? No one is proposing that such couples should be unable to marry, or that having children is a requirement for marriage. People choose marriage for a wide variety of reasons, and it is not the state's right to deny couples the chance to wed legally.

⑦ Interestingly, some of the same people go [so far as to] argue that same-sex couples should not be allowed to raise families and children. On the contrary, society needs parents to raise children in need. In the US, 100,000 children are waiting to be adopted. R. S. Devon's 2010 study found that children of lesbian mothers were rated higher than children of heterosexual parents in social and academic skills, and had fewer social problems. Malls' 2010 paper found that children of gay fathers were "no different to those adopted by heterosexual parents." As Washington Post journalist Ezra Klein argues, "We should be encouraging gay couples to adopt children. We should see this as a great gift that gay marriage could bring to kids who need [nothing more than] two loving parents." Gay marriage would make it easier for same-sex couples

to adopt, and thus provide stable and loving homes for children.

⑧ Marriage [should and can] be redefined as society's attitudes evolve. People in most countries long ago chose to reject the idea that a woman's legal rights and economic identity should be taken over by her husband upon marriage. In the 21st century people have no problem with marriage between people of different races. Today, many states also allow quick divorces. Time passes, attitudes change, and societies evolve; laws ought to reflect those developments. At present, polls show that a majority of citizens in places as different as South Africa, Germany and Brazil all support gay marriage. It is time for our ideas about marriage to evolve once again.

※問題文Ⅰから二箇所引用しているが、Ⅱに出てくる表現も適宜、借用している。まず賛否を決め、論点を原則二つに絞って、構成を考えてから、引用する箇所を探していくという方法とは別に、問題文の記述をヒントにして、構成を決める、という手順もある。今回は、第一段落と最終段落から一箇所ずつ引用することによって、全体の構成に一定の枠を与えている。

解答例1と解答例2のポイントはまったく同じである。圧縮するか引き延ばすかの違いに過ぎない。

ポイント① 同性婚を法的に保護するのが、少なくとも民主主義国の趨勢である。

ポイント② 日本で伝統・文化との軋轢を反対論の論拠とするのは無理があること。

このテーマは本来、様々な条件を考えなければ、軽々に結論を出せる問題ではないが、賛否と一応の構成を決めたら、一定レベル以上の解答を書けるかどうかは、本文中の表現をいかにうまく借用できるかに掛かってくる。オリジナルな英語表現でこの主のテーマを論じることは、ほとんどの受験生の英語の語彙力を超えているからだ。

そのことに気がつけば、参考となる課題文を与えられていない他大学の自由英作文よりもむしろ書きやすいことになる。「構成と論理展開が読むに値するレベルに達していれば」得点は、英語としての誤りの有無によって決まるだろう。ただし、微妙な冠詞の使い分けまで細かくチェックされるかどうかは別である。時間切れで結論まで到達できない恐れがある人は、始めから100語程度を目標とするほうが良いだろう。なお、途中でタイム・アウトになったとしても、書けた部分の構成や英語表現がしっかりしていれば、それなりの得点が可能なはずである。

### 【(A)解答例1】

I agree that the Japanese government should legalize same-sex marriage. Noah Reinbos said in his article (2014) "governments around the world do not allow couples of the same sex to marry," but the trend is toward legalizing same-sex marriage in democratic countries. Democracy is based on the idea that individual rights should be protected. Some argue that gay marriage disagrees with the benefit of society because it does not help to give birth to children. However, There are male-female couples who do not or cannot have a child, so having children is not the only reason for marriage. Though Noah Reinbos insists, "No society should abandon its religious, social and moral traditions," Japan has been traditionally less religious and more generous to same-sex love, especially between males. However, too rapid changes could make society unstable, and therefore we should progressively promote the rights of same-sex couples. (145 words)

【(A)解答例2】

I am of the opinion that the Japanese government should legalize same-sex marriage. Noah Reinbos said in his article (2014) "the vast majority of governments around the world do not allow couples of the same sex to marry," but the trend of the times is toward legalizing same-sex marriage, especially in democratic countries. There, people have come to regard it as a basic civil right. Democracy should be based on the idea that individual rights and liberties are to be protected as far as they are not against public interests.

Some argue that gay marriage disagrees with the benefit of society because it does not help to give birth to children. However, permitting it by law does not mean discouraging or preventing marriage between a male and a female. There are also male-female couples who do not or cannot have a child, so having children is not the only reason for marriage.

Though Noah Reinbos insists, "No society should abandon its religious, social and moral traditions," Japan has been traditionally less religious and more generous to same-sex love, especially between males. Thus, accepting same-sex marriage does not mean throwing away old Japanese traditions. However, too rapid changes could make society confused or unstable, and therefore we should progressively promote the rights of same-sex couples.

(214 words)

以下の設問(A), (B)の中から一つ選んで, 問題文 I ~ III をもとにして, 自分の意見を英語で書きなさい。注意点をよく読んでから書くこと。(2017年)

(A) Should the Japanese government set a national minimum wage? Why, or why not?

(B) Should the Japanese government abolish the inheritance tax? Why, or why not?

注意点:

- (1) 箇条書きは不可。
- (2) 問題文 I, II または III で言及されている見解やことがらを最低一つ引用して, 自分の意見をまとめること。
- (3) 自分の意見と異なる見解にも言及すること。
- (4) 引用する際には, 下の例を参考にすること。

引用例:

- ・ In her 2010 article "Against Zoos", Faerrer claims, "Nature is not ours to control." However, I strongly disagree with that statement, because ...
- ・ I agree to a certain extent with Eve N. Suzuki who argues, "Schools do not protect the rights of students enough." in the essay by Foane (2010).
- ・ According to O'Werke (2012, paragraph 7), one option is indirect taxation. Although this argument ...

I. Read the following article and answer the questions as indicated.

"Unnecessary and Inefficient: the National Minimum Wage"

by Marc Etfoasses (2013)

① The idea of setting minimum wages has been around for hundreds of years. During that time minimum wages seem to have had little or no effect on poverty rates or global inequality. Our societies today are more unequal than ever. Poverty is a relative, not [an absolute] concept, and along with inequality, poverty has actually grown too. Creating state regulations about pay will not make matters better. It will make them worse.

② The main problem with national minimum wage legislation is obvious: it needlessly prevents free market competition. Wages follow the laws of supply and demand, and vary naturally according to the availability and skills of the workers and general market conditions. Creating artificial barriers cannot be the right way to address the issue of cheap labor. Small businesses [consist of] the heart of most flourishing economies. Yet no one is more affected than small businesses and particularly start-ups. These organizations often need to take advantage of cheap labor, particularly in the early stages of development. Many of today's corporate giants [started out] small. Yet how many might have collapsed, had early labor costs been too high?

③ Bureaucracy is never the solution to any business problem. Most able employers can easily find ways to evade the effects of minimum wage laws. They can cut worker hours or hire more workers part-time; they can reduce the number of staff or worker benefits. Employment contracts which guarantee no minimum working hours have become shockingly common in the UK since the National Minimum Wage was re-introduced in 1998. The only certain result of such legi-

- slation is a boost to the "black economy"— the informal, cash economy in which neither employer nor employee pays tax. That cannot be a desirable outcome.
- ④ Furthermore, it is obvious that introducing such schemes can only result in inflation. Many firms who refuse to cut employee hours [can/may/will] do nothing but raise prices eventually. This feeds into the wider economy. One UK study in 2009 found that prices in the minimum wage sectors rose significantly faster in the four years following the minimum wage legislation.
- ⑤ Unemployment is no longer said to be a direct consequence of establishing a minimum wage. But in the UK, where a new National Living Wage is scheduled to be gradually introduced by 2020, even supporters of the legislation acknowledge that over 60,000 jobs will be lost. These job losses may involve the sole earners for many families, so the numbers affected will be far greater. It is [hardly] a co-incidence that France, which has one of the highest minimum wages (60% of the median wage for adults), has also very high rates of youth unemployment — over 25% in 2013 for those aged between 15 and 24.
- ⑥ [Some] would argue that creating a national minimum wage will somehow miraculously revive the struggling economies in our rural areas. True, an increased circulation of cash in these regions would help. However, this measure alone will not prevent migration to the cities. In any case, these areas may well be attractive to investors for different, more compelling reasons, including land availability and cheap rents. Nations will always have areas which lag behind economically and this cannot be magically changed by legislation. Remote islands and mountain areas have their own special set of economic advantages and disadvantages. The national wage [would ignore] these, for no special economic reason, and only marginal gain.
- ⑦ Worst of all is the realization that national minimum wage laws are never entirely fair. With jobs now so hard to find, the lowest-skilled workers usually suffer unemployment the most. Among this group are many young people, who need job experience to gain skills in the first place. Indeed, increased minimum wages may cause employers to discriminate at least temporarily on the basis of gender and race. Finally, where more than one person in a well-off family receives a minimum wage, the point is lost entirely. Without background checks, it is likely that many minimum-wage jobs will fall to those for whom the minimum wage was not intended.
- ⑧ Everybody shares the goal of a fairer society. However, we should be cautious before applying a measure which can never be truly fair. Minimum wages will produce economic distortions, will slow the economy in general and will cause inflation. We should treat the idea with considerable skepticism. There are alternatives: tax reductions for poorer households, stronger labor unions, and better support for education. It is in these areas that progress should be made.

II. は次ページに掲載。

II. Read the following article and answer the questions as indicated.

"The National Minimum Wage: an idea whose time has come?"

by D. Saint-Paix (2015)

① We live in an era of undesirable inequality, both within and between nations. Legislation towards establishing a decent national minimum wage should be at the top of the political agenda in most countries.

② The idea behind the minimum wage is far from new. In medieval England it was first put into law in 1351 by Edward III. His legislation was designed to [create a maximum] wage, but labor at the time was so short that ironically the opposite resulted, and a wage floor was established instead. In the twentieth century, many countries adopted minimum wage laws. In the US, Massachusetts was the first US state to adopt a minimum wage in 1912, but many other states rapidly imitated. As President Roosevelt put it in 1933, "No business which depends for existence on paying less than living wages to its workers has any right to continue in this country."

③ Critics of a nationally-agreed minimum wage usually protest about the supposed economic costs. Far from being too expensive, however, a decent national minimum wage would actually stimulate the domestic economy. Putting cash into the hands of the poorest ensures [it would be spent] locally, thus boosting consumption. As the bosses at two leading US discount retailers have stated recently, they are in favor of an increased federal minimum wage: most of their customers are among the poorly-paid.

④ Studies have confirmed that economic costs need not follow. In the 1990s, exceptional Princeton economists David Card and Alan B. Krueger studied the comparative effects on fast-food restaurants and low-wage employment in New Jersey, which raised the minimum wage, and Pennsylvania, where it remained at the federal level. [Two academics turned conventional wisdom upside down]: their data demonstrated that a modest increase in wages did not appear to cause any significant harm to employment; in some cases, a rise in the minimum wage even resulted in a slight increase in employment.

⑤ Efficiency is actually encouraged by a minimum wage. Workers are encouraged to gain new skills and to invest in their surroundings. The low-paid often find employment at large corporations; yet these businesses often struggle with staff turnover. Poorly-paid workers quit early: in the US a mere 8 months is the average. Yet where hourly rates are higher, for example in Denmark, it is clear that workers are happy to stay and to master the business. This rewards the companies that invest in their workers and reduces hiring costs. Most long-established firms that have agreed to pay a decent living wage have reported a better standard of work. Furthermore, for employers, the minimum wage provides an indirect incentive to invest in technology and increase productivity. Firms can no longer simply count on cheap labor to maximize profits.

⑥ Many positive social effects can follow. Two groups who are at present disadvantaged would clearly benefit. The young, who often have to work for very low pay, would find the means to study and improve their chances. [Additionally], women, who make up the bulk of the lowly-paid, would be able to improve conditions not just for themselves, but also for their children, thus creating momentum towards a better society. [Specifically], those women receiving or trying to gain the minimum wage would have greater incentives to



get education. [Finally], older male workers already in lower-paid jobs would also be motivated to try harder for increased pay.

⑦ Because a minimum wage rewards work, it must surely be preferable to government payments. In fact, this is one way governments can reduce their welfare administration. Governments everywhere waste considerable sums on multiple programs to combat poverty. Wouldn't it be fairer, however, to make employers properly reward work than to have the state hand out free money? A decent wage for those who worked might also prevent many from turning to drugs or crime, and slow the growth of the underground loan businesses. Companies can and should contribute to social welfare.

⑧ Today, the main questions about the minimum wage should not be [whether] to require it, but at what level to fix it, and how to harmonize it across a nation. India, where there are 1,200 different minimum wages, illustrates the economic disadvantages of not creating a simple but fair regime. India is far from alone, however. In many developed countries, minimum wages are set either by specific industries, or by local, not national authorities (e.g. Japan). On the other hand, failure to set a national living wage leaves citizens in remote areas at a profound disadvantage and contributes to undesirable urbanization, by drawing valuable human resources from the countryside to the big cities.

⑨ Fixing a national minimum wage is a vital step for most nations today. Many economists have long argued for it. Adam Smith himself believed that the poor "should have such a share of the produce of their own labor as to be themselves reasonably well fed, clothed and lodged." That is what current campaigns for a standard minimum wage are all about. Ultimately, the minimum wage should be set at a level which would enable the person who earned it to lead a decent life. It simply needs political will.

※2018年からは 注意点の(3)が

(3) 自分の意見と異なる見解にも言及すること。  
から

(3) 自分の意見と異なる見解にも言及して、それに反論すること。  
に変わっている。

ただし「自分の意見と異なる見解に言及したら」、「それに反論する」のは普通に求められることである。したがって、大きな変化が生じたわけではなく、すでに提示した2014年～2016年の解答例もそうなっている。

※2017年の問題で問われているのは a national minimum wage 「全国一律の最低賃金」に対する賛否であって、一般的な a minimum wage 「最低賃金」に対する賛否ではないことに注意。ただし本文の記述でも、両者の違いが明記されている箇所は限られている。この箇所を見落とさないこと。

※賛否のどちらが書き易いかの判断はたいへん難しい。両方の課題文そのものが説得力のある明確な論拠を挙げているとは言い難いからだ。とはいえ、十分な背景知識がある人はまずいない。課題文 I, II のうち内容を読み取り易いほうの英文をベースにすることになるだろう。提示した[解答例 1]は、経済に関する一般論で語数を稼いでいる。説得力のある明快な内容にはなっていないが、書きにくいテーマが出題されたときの参考にしてほしい。圧縮して語数をへらしたのが[解答例 2]である。  
※なお、2020年時点での日本の都道府県別最低賃金は、最高1,103円(東京都)、最低792円(東北, 山陰, 四国, 九州, 沖縄の7県)、平均902円となっている。

【(A)解答例1】

I agree that the Japanese government should set a national minimum wage. The Japanese economy has been steadily declining for more than two decades. Some claim that this is because of the declining birthrate and the aging population. Others argue that it is due to the failure of the government in economic policies. Probably most will admit that it has caused unemployment, underemployment, and low-paid work, as well as financial gaps between metropolitan and local cities. Introducing a national minimum wage is the most effective way to solve these. Critics believe that it increases, rather than decreases, unemployment or underemployment because companies, especially small ones, have to cut costs to avoid raising prices. However, according to D. Saint-Paix (2015, paragraph 4), a modest increase in wages did not appear to cause any significant harm to employment; in some cases, a rise in the minimum wage even resulted in a slight increase in employment. Critics also regard it as natural for nations to have areas that lag economically and claim that legislation cannot readily change this. To be sure, that is true to some degree, but leaving this with the laws of supply and demand, not taking any measure, is the government's irresponsibility. As D. Saint-Paix insists, "failure to set a national living wage leaves citizens in remote areas at a profound disadvantage." It is the role of politics to tackle this problem. Therefore, I agree with the idea that the Japanese government should set a national minimum wage. (250 words)

【(A)解答例2】

I agree that the Japanese government should set a national minimum wage. The Japanese economy has been declining. That has caused unemployment, underemployment, and low-paid work, as well as economic gaps among prefectures. Introducing a national minimum wage is the most effective way to solve these. Critics believe that it increases unemployment or underemployment because companies have to cut costs to avoid raising prices. However, according to D. Saint-Paix, a modest increase in wages did not appear to cause any significant harm to employment but even resulted in a slight increase in employment. Critics also regard it as natural for nations to have areas that lag economically and claim that legislation cannot readily change this. However, leaving this with the laws of supply and demand is the government's irresponsibility. As D. Saint-Paix insists, "failure to set a national living wage leaves citizens in remote areas at a profound disadvantage." Therefore, I agree with the idea that the Japanese government should set a national minimum wage. (165 words)