

【I】 次の文章を読み、下の設問に答えよ。

Classical liberalism has been in decline for more than a century. Since the second half of the nineteenth century, in the U.S. as well as in Western Europe, public affairs have increasingly been shaped instead by socialist ideas. In fact, the twentieth century may well be described as the century *par excellence* of socialism: of communism, fascism, national socialism, and most enduringly of social democracy including modern American “liberalism” and neoconservatism.

Assuming that the course of human history is determined by ideas (rather than “blind forces”) and historical changes are the result of ideological (ア) in public opinion, it follows that the socialist transformation of the last hundred years must be understood as the result of liberalism’s intellectual—philosophical and theoretical—defeat, i.e., the increasing rejection in public opinion of the liberal doctrine as faulty. In this situation, liberals can react in two ways. On the one hand, they may still want to maintain that liberalism is a (イ) doctrine and that the public rejects it in spite of its truth. In this case, one must explain why people cling to false beliefs, even if they are aware of correct liberal ideas. Does the truth not always hold its own attraction and rewards? Furthermore, one must explain why the liberal truth is *increasingly* rejected in (ウ) of socialist falsehoods. Did the population become more indolent or degenerate? If so, how can this be explained? On the other hand, one may consider the rejection as indicative of an error in one’s doctrine. In this case, one must reconsider its theoretical foundations and identify the error which can (エ) not only for the doctrine’s rejection as false but more importantly for the actual course of events. In other words, the socialist transformation must be explained as an intelligible and systematically predictable progressive deconstruction and degeneration of liberal political theory originating in and logically arising from this error as the ultimate source of all subsequent socialist confusion.

(Adapted from Hans-Hermann Hoppe, *Democracy: The God That Failed*, Routledge, 2017, pp. 221, 224.)

※ページ下部に出典を追記しております。

1. 空所(ア)～(エ)に入る最も適切なものを、それぞれ a～d から選べ。

- | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| (ア) a. boundaries | b. expectations | c. grounds | d. shifts |
| (イ) a. sham | b. solitary | c. sound | d. strange |
| (ウ) a. favor | b. lieu | c. memory | d. spite |
| (エ) a. account | b. apologize | c. apply | d. ask |

2. 下線部を和訳せよ。

※WEB 掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。

Used with permission of Routledge from "On the Errors of Classical Liberalism and the Future of Liberty" in "Democracy: The God That Failed" by Hans-Hermann Hoppe, 2001, pp. 221, 224; permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.

【Ⅱ】 次の文章を読み、下の設問に答えよ。

I want to touch on another point of convergence between the arts and science. And this is the question of aesthetics. In 1858 and 1915, Darwin and Einstein, driven in part by the somewhat ignoble or worldly ambition to be first, redirected not only the course of science, but redefined our sense of ourselves. These twin revolutions, barely sixty years apart, represent the most profound as well as the most rapid shift and dislocation in human thought that has ever occurred. (1)The counter-intuitive notion that the Earth revolves around the Sun took generations to spread and take hold across Europe. Likewise, the brilliant invention of three- and four-crop rotation. A teeming microscopic world was available to medicine from the time in the 1670s onwards when Antoni van Leeuwenhoek began sending his observations to the Royal Society in London. (2)But stubborn tradition-bound medicine kept its back turned on science, and it took almost another 200 years before an understanding of harmful microorganisms and the concept of anti-sepsis shaped medical practice.

A theory that suggested the relatedness of all species, including humans, was a challenge to dignity, and the church found it hard at first to accept the suggestion that species were not fixed, unchanging and recently made by God. Generally, however, Darwin's ideas explained too much, too well, and were too much in accord with new observations in geology to be resisted, especially by biologists, and many English clergymen with country livings were good naturalists and could immediately grasp the theory's utility. What is interesting about the publication of *On the Origin of Species* is the rapidity of its acceptance.

Einstein's theory could be empirically tested by observing the degree of refraction of starlight by the Sun, best achieved at a full eclipse. Various expeditions were sent from 1918, and (3)though they returned what seemed a positive result, in reality the margin of error in measurements was too great to provide absolute confirmation. And, meanwhile, the theory was already in the textbooks by the late 1920s. Radio telescopes in the early 1950s provided the definitive proof, and by then relativity theory was a staple of physics and astronomy.

(Adapted from Ian McEwan, *Science*, Vintage, 2019, pp. 48-50.)

※WEB 掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。

McEwan, I., 2019. *Science*: Vintage Minis. London: Vintage (Jonathan Cape), pp. 48-50.

1. 下線部(1)を和訳せよ。
2. 下線部(2)を和訳せよ。
3. 下線部(3)を和訳せよ。
4. 次の英文を本文中のふさわしい位置に挿入した時、その直前に来る 3 語を記せ。

This rapidity is worth considering.

〔以下余白〕

受験番号	
氏名	カナ
	漢字

この欄以外に受験番号、氏名を記入しないこと。
漢字氏名がない場合は、ひらがなで記入すること。

2025 年度 早稲田大学大学院文学研究科入学試験

解答用紙（横書）

【博士後期課程】 一般外国語 英 語

総 点

【 I 】

1.
- (ア)

- (イ)

- (ウ)

- (エ)

2.
- _____

【Ⅱ】

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

〔以下余白〕