2018年度
筆記審査
（問　題）

注 意 事 項

1．試験開始の指示があるまで、問題冊子および解答用紙には手を触れないこと。

2．問題は２～９ページに記載されている。試験中に問題冊子の印刷不鮮明，ページの落丁・乱丁および解答用紙の汚れ等に気づいた場合は，手を挙げて監督員に知らせること。

3．解答はすべて、ＨＢの黒鉛筆またはＨＢのシャープペンシルで記入すること。

4．記述解答用紙記入上の注意

(1) 記述解答用紙の所定欄（２カ所）に、氏名（カタカナ）および受験番号を正確に丁寧に記入すること。

(2) 所定欄以外に受験番号・氏名を記入した解答用紙は採点の対象外となる場合がある。

(3) 受験番号の記入にあたっては、次の数字見本にしたがい、読みやすいように、正確に丁寧に記入すること。

数字見本	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

5．解答はすべて所定の解答欄に記入すること。所定欄以外に何かを記入した解答用紙は採点の対象外となる場合がある。

6．試験終了の指示が出たら、すぐに解答をやめ、筆記用具を置き解答用紙を裏返しにすること。

7．いかなる場合でも，すべての解答用紙を必ず提出すること。

8．試験終了後，問題冊子および下書き用紙は持ち帰ること。

I. Cities and Agricultural Productivity

It can readily be seen in the world today that agriculture is not even tolerably productive unless it incorporates many goods and services produced in cities or transplanted from cities. The most thoroughly rural countries exhibit the most unproductive agriculture. The most thoroughly urbanized countries, on the other hand, are precisely those that produce food most abundantly.

Surges in agricultural productivity follow the growth of cities. Japanese cities began their modern industrial and commercial growth in the latter part of the nineteenth century and by World War II Japan had become a highly urbanized country. During this time, although Japanese farmers were industrious and thrifty, and although they used their land most carefully, neither they nor the city population were well-fed. Rice was the basic foodstuff; for many Japanese there was little else except wild food – fish from the sea. Yet Japan did not raise enough rice for her own people and a full quarter of what they consumed had to be imported. It was the custom to ascribe this severe food deficit to Japan's small supply of farmable land.

But after the war and during the 1950s remarkable changes occurred in Japanese agriculture, changes that cannot be explained by catchwords like "reform"; indeed, the Japanese made advances that have not been made in countries where reform of agriculture, land-holding and rural life have all been pursued more determinedly.

What happened in Japan was, although wonderfully effective, commonplace. The rural world began receiving, in vast amounts, for the first time, fertilizers, machines, electric power, refrigeration equipment, the results of plant and animal research, and a host of other goods and services developed in cities – the same cities where the richest food markets already lay.

Japanese agriculture rapidly achieved a degree of productivity that had been thought impossible. In 1960, although the population was twenty-five percent larger than it had been before the war, and total consumption of rice had soared, Japanese farms were supplying all of Japan's rice. None was any longer imported. Even more interesting, the per capita consumption of rice had dropped a little, but not because of shortages. Like the steady, long-term drop in starch consumption in the United States, this drop was caused by the availability of more abundant and varied food. The farmers, in addition to supplying more rice, were producing so much more milk and other dairy products, chickens, eggs, meat, fruits and vegetables that the Japanese were not only eating more than before, they were also eating better. Nowadays when Japan imports food, and pays for it with industrial products, it imports meats, not rice.

If modern Japanese cities had waited to grow until a surplus of rural products could support that growth, they would be waiting still. Japan, reinventing its agriculture, has accomplished abruptly and rapidly what the United States did somewhat more gradually and Western Europe more gradually still. It created rural productivity upon a foundation of city productivity. There is no inherent reason why this cannot be done by other nations even more rapidly.

Modern productive agriculture has been reinvented thanks to hundreds of innovations that were exported from the cities to the countryside, transplanted to the countryside or imitated in the countryside. We are accustomed to think of these innovations in large, rather abstract groupings: chemical fertilizers, mechanical sowers, cultivators, harvesters, tractors and other substitutes for draft animals and hand labor; mechanical refrigeration; pipes, sprinklers, pumps and other modern irrigation equipment; laboratories for research into plant and animal diseases and their control; soil analyses and weather forecasting systems; new hybridized plants; marketing and transportation systems; canning, freezing and drying technologies; methods of spreading information... The list is long.

To be sure, one can often find fertilizer factories, tractor plants, agricultural research stations, nurseries and electric power plants located in the rural world far from cities. But these activities were not created there. This is so not because farmers and other rural people are less creative than city residents. The difference lies in the contrasting natures of rural and urban economies, for it is in cities that new goods and services are first created. Even innovations created specifically for farming depend directly upon earlier developments of city work. McCormick's first horse-drawn reaper was a tremendous innovation for farm work; here was a machine that replaced hand implements and complex manual labor. Although this was new for farm work, the same idea and devices, similar in principle, were already commonly used in industrial work. Nor could McCormick have manufactured the reaper if other industrial tools had not already been developed. The industrial revolution occurred first in cities and later in agriculture.

(Adapted from Jane Jacobs (1970) *The Economy of Cities,* New York: Vintage Books. First published in 1969.)

(1) Choose the THREE statements below that are TRUE and mark them on your answer sheet.

A) Japan's economic prosperity after World War II was achieved because it first improved its rural productivity, which then made an improvement in urban prosperity possible.

B) A large increase in Japan's population after World War II made rice shortages worse, resulting in lower per capita consumption of rice.

C) Japan's postwar increase in urban productivity made possible an increase in rural productivity.

D) After World War II Japanese rice production declined overall because farmers switched to producing other agricultural products.

E) Urban prosperity is built on exploitation of rural agricultural economies.

F) Cities were important markets for rural produce.

G) Japan depended on rice imports before World War II.

(2) On a calorie-based calculation, Japan's food self-sufficiency ratio (the proportion of food it consumes that is produced within Japan) is currently around forty percent. Based on the text above, how might the author explain why it is not closer to 100 percent? Why was the Japanese homeland not self-sufficient in food in the lead-up to World War II? Answer using the space provided on the answer sheet, in your own words IN ENGLISH.

(3) What might be done to improve the future economic prospects of Japan's rural areas? Answer in the space provided on the answer sheet IN ENGLISH.

II. Europe is Bigger than Brexit

It seems symbolic that Helmut Kohl, the man who oversaw the reunification of Germany, should die on the eve of negotiations leading to Britain's withdrawal from the European Union (EU). So long a giant on the European stage, Kohl made the best of the extraordinary circumstances and public mood that followed the collapse of communism.

Today's European leaders are faced with challenging circumstances: Trump, Putin, Erdoğan, terrorism, [1] flows of migration, unemployment, the rise of populism and, of course, Brexit. But, just as Chancellor Kohl and then-French president François Mitterrand together relaunched the European project in the early 1990s, today's leaders Angela Merkel and Emmanuel Macron are readying their ambitions and vision for the European continent. Meanwhile, Britain prepares to leave.

At stake is no less than Europe's role in defending liberal democratic values and a rules-based international order. This is at a time when – as one former Obama administration official said recently – Trump's America is "missing in action and the UK is disappearing into oblivion". Britain's central weakness lies not only in its internal political problems, but also with a dangerous ignorance of what its European neighbors are focused on. In fact, the Franco-German partnership is not focusing on Brexit but rather on consolidating the 60-year-old European project through further integration and cooperation. At the heart of this stands an emerging Macron-Merkel deal, intended to function as Europe's new powerhouse. On 15 May, the French and German leaders met and spoke of a new "roadmap" for the EU. The thinking goes like this: in the next two to three years, as France carries out structural economic reforms to boost its credibility, Germany will boost much-needed European financial cooperation and investment mechanisms, and embrace a new role in foreign policy, security and defense.

For Britain, being aware of the wider European context should be an important part of assessing its options. The disturbing fact, from Britain's perspective, is that however important a challenge Brexit may represent, it is not Europeans' main concern. Brexit is not their obsession, but a British one. Continental Europeans mostly see it as a tedious burden whose outcome can only be bad for everyone, so the focus is on limiting damage.

Outside Britain, the mood in the EU is [2]: Europe's economic situation has improved; unemployment in the eurozone is at its lowest since 2009 (but still at 9.5%); growth has returned. Mario Draghi, the head of the European Central Bank, speaks of "a solid and broad recovery". Nationalist forces have suffered political defeats, in Austria, the Netherlands, France, Italy and Finland. Across the continent, citizens' support for the EU is on the rise, according to Eurobarometer surveys. It seems that all the shockwaves the continent has felt in recent years have brought a renewed sense of belonging, and an appetite for better, if not more, integration. To be clear: this is not thanks to Brexit, but despite it. Strengthening the EU project and opening up horizons is what Germany, France and the European Commission are intensely working on.

The point is that the EU has turned a corner, and feels more confident. It wants to develop its capacities to act internationally beyond its borders – not just endlessly fix its internal problems. It has no other choice, because of its geopolitical environment. One German official said his country was undergoing a significant change because public opinion had come around to the view that "Europe should take on more responsibility" if the US [3]. A new narrative is in the air.

Yet the news is not all positive. There are concerns about Italian banks, for example. Germany's finance ministry is still [4] anything that may burden German taxpayers. Whether Germany should play a larger security role continues to stir intense domestic debate – even as the country deploys troops in Lithuania as part of Nato's deterrence of Russia. Brexit will be time-consuming and will take up huge amounts of energy. However, precisely because of Brexit, and Trump, Europe now has an unprecedented role in defending values and international institutions, insists a former Obama official: "Europe needs to hold the fort, as long as Trump remains in office. It's Europe's moment".

Just as Kohl and Mitterrand seized the opportunities that history presented to them, Merkel and Macron are, in different circumstances, identifying their path towards a common European endeavor. After a decade of crisis, Europe may now be on the up; just as Britain is leaving.

(Adapted from an article by Natalie Nougayrède in *The Guardian*, 18 June 2017.)

(1) Write your answers to these questions in the appropriate spaces on the answer sheet.

[1] Choose the BEST word to fill in blank [1].

A) declining
B) small
C) unprecedented
D) welcome

[2] Choose the BEST word to fill in blank [2].

A) still defiant
B) on the upswing
C) increasingly pessimistic
D) grim

[3] Choose the BEST word, based on the author's argument, to fill in the blank [3].

A) advanced
B) collapsed
C) invaded
D) retreated

[4] Choose the BEST option to fill in blank [4].

A) supportive of

B) resistant to

C) flexible with

D) encouraging toward

(2) Does the author believe that Brexit has weakened commitment to the European integration project? Explain why, in your own words. Answer in the space provided on the answer sheet IN ENGLISH.

(3) The article refers to the issue of international responsibility. Does the world need strong leadership today? If so, why and by whom? Answer in the space provided on the answer sheet IN ENGLISH.

III. Is Inequality about to get Unimaginably Worse?

Could advances in technology, genetics and artificial intelligence lead to a world in which economic inequality turns into biological inequality?

Inequality goes back at least 30,000 years. Hunter-gatherer societies were more equal than subsequent societies. They had very little property, and property is fundamental to long-term inequality. But even they had hierarchies. In the 19th and 20th Centuries, however, something changed. Equality became a dominant value in human culture, almost all over the world. Why? It was partly due to the rise of new ideologies such as humanism, liberalism and socialism. But it was also about technological and economic change – which was connected to those new ideologies, of course. Suddenly the elite needed large numbers of healthy, educated people to serve as soldiers in the army and as workers in the factories. Governments didn't educate and vaccinate to be nice. They needed the masses to be useful. But now that's changing again. The best armies today require a small number of highly professional soldiers using very high-tech equipment. Factories, too, are increasingly automated.

This is one reason why we might – in the not-too-distant future – see the creation of the most unequal societies that have ever existed in human history. And there are other reasons to fear such a future. With rapid improvements in biotechnology and bioengineering, we may reach a point where, for the first time in history, economic inequality becomes biological inequality. Until now, humans had control of the world outside them. They could control the rivers, forests, animals and plants. But they had very little control of the world inside them. They had limited ability to alter, even engineer, their own bodies, brains and minds. They couldn't cheat death. That might not always be the case.

There are two main ways to upgrade humans. Either you change something in their biological structure by changing their DNA. Or, the more radical way, you combine organic and manmade parts – perhaps directly connecting brains and computers. The rich – through purchasing such biological improvements – could become, literally, better than the rest; more intelligent, healthier and with far greater life-spans. At that point, it will make sense to give up power to this "enhanced" class. Think about it like this. In the past, the upper classes tried to convince the masses that they were superior to everyone else and so should hold power. In the future I am describing, elites really will be superior to the masses. And because they will be better than us, it will make sense to hand over power and decision-making to them.

We might also find that the rise of artificial intelligence – and not just automation – will mean that huge numbers of people, in all kinds of jobs, simply lose their economic usefulness. The two processes together – human enhancement and the rise of AI – may result in the separation of humankind into a very small class of super-humans and a massive underclass of "useless" people.

Here's a concrete example. Think about the transportation market. You have thousands of truck, taxi and bus drivers in the UK. Each of them commands a small share of the transportation

market, and they gain political power because of that. They can form labor unions, and if the government does something they don't like, they can go on strike and shut down the entire transportation system. Now fast-forward 30 years. All vehicles are self-driving. One corporation controls the technology that controls the entire transport market. All the economic power previously shared by thousands, and all their political power, would then be in the hands of a single corporation.

Once you lose your economic importance, the state loses at least some of the incentive to invest in your health, education and welfare. It's very dangerous to be not needed. Your future depends on the goodwill of some small elite. Maybe there is goodwill. But in a time of crisis – like climate catastrophe – it would be very easy to discard you. We can still do something about all this. Technology is not deterministic. But I think we should be aware that what I'm describing is one possible future. If we don't like this possibility, we need to act before it's too late. There is one more possible step on the road to previously unimaginable inequality.

In the short-term, authority might shift to a small elite that owns and controls the master computers and the data that feeds them. In the longer term, however, authority could shift completely from humans to the machines. Once AI is smarter than us, all humanity could be made redundant. What would happen after that? We have absolutely no idea. We truly can't imagine it. How could we? We are talking about an intelligence far greater than that which humanity currently possesses.

(Adapted from an article by Professor Yuval Noah Harari which was first published on the BBC website on 28 April 2017.)

(1) Are the following statements true or false according to the passage? Write "T" for "true" or "F" for "false" as appropriate in the boxes on the answer sheet.

A) During the last two centuries elites also benefited from policies to look after poorer members of society.

B) The author believes that humans are probably already powerless to stop the eventual takeover by computers.

C) The author suggests that in the future even elites might lose out to computer algorithms.

(2) The author imagines a scenario in which it would make sense to hand over power to an "enhanced" class. Explain, in your own words, why the author sees such a possibility, and why he concludes that it would make sense to give up control to a small elite. Does the author think this would be a positive development? Write IN ENGLISH in the space provided on the answer sheet.

(3) In response to the kinds of ideas expressed in this article, what kind of education do you think that the School of International Liberal Studies at Waseda University should provide to prepare graduates well for a rapidly changing, less equal, world? Write your answer IN ENGLISH in the space provided on the answer sheet.

<2018 年度>

受験番号	万	千	百	十	一
氏名（カタカナ）					

（注意）所定の欄以外に受験番号・氏名を書いてならない。

筆記審査（解答用紙）

QUESTION

I

<2018 年度>

I

I ☞ 解答を始める前に、問題番号を確めること。

(1)

(2)

(3)

<2018 年度>

受験番号	万	千	百	十	一
氏名（カタカナ）					

（注意） 所定の欄以外に受験番号・氏名を書いてならない。

筆記審査（解答用紙）

QUESTION

II

<2018 年度>

II

II ☞ 解答を始める前に、問題番号を確めること。

(1)

[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]

(2)

(3)

<2018 年度>

受験番号	万	千	百	十	一
氏名（カタカナ）					

（注意） 所定の欄以外に受験番号・氏名を書いてならない。

筆記審査（解答用紙）

QUESTION

Ⅲ

<2018 年度>

Ⅲ

Ⅲ ☞ 解答を始める前に、問題番号を確めること。

(1)

A	B	C

(2)

(3)