令和 2 (2020) 年度入学試験問題 (前期)

英　　語

注　　意

1. 合図があるまで表紙をあけないこと。
2. 受験票は机上に出しておくこと。

英　語（前　期）　（その1）

Ⅰ　以下の英文を読み，問いに答えよ。

It seems heartless and cruel to talk about cost-effectiveness in the same sentence as a dying child. But if you think about it, working out the most cost-effective way of saving as many children's lives as possible is the least heartless exercise of them all.

Paying too much attention to the individual visible victim rather than to the numbers can lead us to spend all our resources on a fraction of the problem, and therefore save much fewer lives. This principle applies anywhere we are prioritizing scarce resources. It is hard for people to talk about resources when it comes to saving lives, or prolonging or improving them. Doing so is often taken for heartlessness. (1) Yet so long as resources are not infinite, it is the most compassionate thing to do to use your brain and work out how to do the most good with what you have.

You tend to get things out of proportion. Getting things out of proportion, or misjudging the size of things, is something that we humans do naturally. It is instinctive to look at a lonely number and misjudge its importance. It is also instinctive to misjudge the importance of a single instance or an identifiable victim. These two tendencies are the two key aspects of the size instinct.

The two aspects of the size instinct make us systematically underestimate the progress that has been made in the world. In the test questions about global proportions, people consistently say about 20 percent of people are having their basic needs met. The correct answer in most cases is close to 80 percent or even 90 percent. Proportion of children vaccinated: 88 percent. Proportion of people with electricity: 85 percent. Proportion of girls in primary school: 90 percent. (2) The use of numbers that sound enormous, together with constant images of individual suffering presented by the charities and the media, distorts people's view of the world.

At the same time, we systematically overestimate other proportions. The proportion of immigrants in our countries. The proportion of people opposed to homosexuality. In each of these cases, at least in the United States and Europe, our interpretations are more dramatic than the reality.

To avoid getting things out of proportion you need only two magic tools: comparing and dividing.

The most important thing you can do to avoid misjudging something's importance is to avoid lonely numbers. Never, ever leave a number all by itself. Never believe that one number on its own can be meaningful. If you are offered one number, always ask for at least one more. Something to compare it with. Be especially careful about big numbers. It is a strange thing, but numbers over a certain size, when they are not compared with anything else, always look big. And how can something big not be important?

Last year, 4.2 million babies died. That is the most recent number reported by UNICEF of deaths before the age of one, worldwide. We often see lonely and emotionally charged numbers like this in the news or in the materials of activist groups or organizations. They produce a reaction.

Who can even imagine 4.2 million dead babies? It is so terrible, and even worse when we know that almost all died from easily preventable diseases. And how can anyone argue that 4.2 million is anything other than a huge number? You might think that nobody would even try to argue that, but you would be wrong. That is exactly why I mentioned this number. Because (3) it is not huge: it is beautifully small.

The number 4.2 million is for 2016. The year before, the number was 4.4 million. The year before that, it was 4.5 million. Back in 1950, it was 14.4 million. That's almost 10 million more dead babies per year, compared with today. Suddenly this terrible number starts to look smaller. In fact the number has never been lower.

Of course, I am the first person to wish the number was even lower and falling even faster. (4) But to know how to act, and how to prioritize resources, nothing can be more important than doing the cool-headed math and realizing what works and what doesn't.

（出典：Hans Rosling, *Factfulness: Ten Reasons We're Wrong About The World — And Why Things Are Better Than You Think*, Sceptre, 2018. 一部変更あり）

(1)　下線部(1)を訳せ。

(2)　下線部(2)を訳せ。

(3)　下線部(3)について，なぜそのように言えるのかを50字以内の日本語（句読点を含む）で説明せよ。

(4)　下線部(4)を訳せ。

Ⅱ　以下の英文を読み，下線部を和訳せよ。

Try to visualise the internet. For me, it is something hazy, suspended somewhere above our heads as we gaze at our screens. It's composed of tiny, moving fragments of information and simultaneous conversations, and it has no defined edges: it is limitless.

(1) This view of the internet as something infinite, open to free exploration, is perhaps both naive and arrogant but, for an English speaker, it is not a sense of privilege that is completely without reason. The first language used on the internet was almost certainly English. By the mid 1990s it was estimated that English made up 80% of the content.

However, from once dominating the web, English now represents just one language in an online linguistic elite. English's relative share of cyberspace has shrunk to around 30%, while French, German, Spanish and Chinese have all pushed into the top 10 languages online. Out of a roughly 6,000 languages in use today, these top 10 make up 82% of the total of the content on the internet.

Does the language you speak online matter? The unprecedented ability to communicate and access information are all promises woven into the big sell of the internet connection. But how different is your experience if your mother tongue, for example, is Zulu rather than English?

The relationship between language and the internet is a growing area of policy interest and academic study. The story emerging is one where language profoundly affects your experience of the internet. It guides who you speak to on social media. It determines how much — if any — information you can access on Wikipedia. Google searching "restaurants" in a certain language may bring you back 10 times the results of doing so in another. (2) And if your language is endangered, it is possible it will never have a life online. Far from infinite, the internet, it seems, is only as big as your language.

Language is just as important to building human connections online as it is offline: it forms the basis of how users identify with each other, the lines on which exclusion and inclusion are often drawn, and the boundaries within which communities grow around common interests.

On Wikipedia there are huge asymmetries in the volume of online content in different language editions. Out of the 288 official language editions, English is by some distance the largest edition in terms of users, followed by German and then French. On the other side of the spectrum, there is a near absence of any content in many African and Asian languages.

And even if you speak a dominant language, you still get a limited view of the information available. You might assume that there would be many universal themes or popular historical events in common across different language editions. There is however less common content across language editions than you might expect.

In 2011 the UN declared access to the internet as a basic human right. It is clear however that access alone is not enough to put everyone on an equal digital footing. As the internet and social media become increasingly embedded in how we connect with and understand the world around us, so too does the language we use to access that experience.

"The internet is becoming the town square for the global village of tomorrow," said Bill Gates. But if the vast majority of the world's languages don't have a digital future, what will speakers have to sacrifice to be heard in the "digital town square"? Closing the digital divide clearly has huge potential to empower individuals around the world. (3) At the moment, however, looking through the lens of language leaves claims that the internet is an inclusive, equally available public space sounding more and more hollow.

(出典：Holly Young, "The Digital Language Divide", *The Guardian*, 2015. 一部変更あり)

Ⅲ　下線部を英訳せよ。

(1) 脳科学は長い間，いわゆる女性脳(female brain)は男性脳(male brain)より進化論的に劣っている，という考えにとらわれていた。こうした考えは，それぞれの脳が固有の特徴を持っているということを前提としており，男の子は誰でも科学的，論理的である一方，女の子は感情的で科学に向かない，といった固定観念の形成に寄与してきた。(2) こうした偏見は古くからの性差への信仰に由来しており，個性に基づいて個人を判断することを妨げてきたのだ。(3) しかし，ここ30年の脳科学の進展により，我々の脳の働きが，生活環境，教育，仕事，趣味等さまざまな要因に応じて生涯を通じて変化しうることがわかった。