Ⅰ　次の英文を読み，下の問いに答えなさい。（＊を付した語句には，問題文の末尾に注がある。）

When Jane Jacobs, author of the 1961 book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, outlined the qualities of successful neighborhoods, she included "eyes on the street", or, as she described this, the "eyes belonging to those we might call the natural owners of the street", including shopkeepers and residents going about their daily routines. Not every neighborhood enjoyed the benefit of this informal sense of community, of course, but it was widely seen to be (1) desirable. What Jacobs understood is that the combined impact of many local people practicing normal levels of awareness in their neighborhoods on any given day is surprisingly effective for community building, with the added benefit of building trust and discouraging crime.

Jacobs's promotion of these "natural owners of the street" was a response to a mid-century concern that aggressive city planning would destroy the lively experience of neighborhoods like her own, the Village in New York City. Jacobs famously criticized "master planner" Robert Moses after he proposed building an expressway through Lower Manhattan, a scheme that, had it succeeded, would have destroyed Washington Square Park and the Village, and turned neighborhoods around SoHo into highway underpasses*. For Jacobs and her fellow citizen activists, the efficiency of the proposed highway was not enough to justify eliminating busy sidewalks and streets, where people played a crucial role in maintaining the health and order of their communities.

Today, a different form of efficient design is eliminating "eyes on the street"—by replacing them with technological ones. The increase in neighborhood surveillance technologies such as home security cameras and digital neighborhood-watch platforms and apps has freed us from the constraints of having to be physically present to monitor our homes and streets. Jacobs's "eyes on the street" are now cameras on many homes, and the everyday

interactions between neighbors and strangers are now a network of cameras and platforms that promise to put "neighborhood security in your hands", as one major app puts it.

Inside our homes, we monitor ourselves and our family members with equal enthusiasm, making use of video baby monitors, GPS-tracking software for children's smartphones (or for secret surveillance by a suspicious partner), and "smart" speakers that are always listening and often recording when they shouldn't. A new generation of domestic robots, such as Amazon's Astro, combines several of these features into a wandering service-machine always at your beck and call around the house and ever watchful of its security when you are away.

(2) When debates arise over the threat such technologies might pose to people's privacy, critics often focus on the power of large corporations to control our personal data. Or they focus on the role of personal security cameras and safety apps in racial profiling* and discriminatory policing. But surveillance clearly provides benefits — and means of abuse — to far more people than Big Tech* and law enforcement. These are wildly popular technologies among private citizens. (3) We like to look at ourselves and to monitor others, and there are an increasing number of new technologies encouraging us to do just that.

(4) In many ways, our enthusiastic acceptance of social media ten to twenty years ago softened the ground for our current tolerance for person-to-person surveillance technologies. Who needs a local busybody* or town gossip when you have so many people willing to share their most private experiences on X or Instagram — and so many people eager to judge them for it? Social media has long acted as a tool of mutual surveillance, even as it has failed to achieve the thriving "digital town square" and healthy communities its creators promised.

Today's surveillance technologies offer something equally attractive: A sense of control at a time when many people feel that institutions and systems meant to protect them have broken down. Inside the home, among loved ones,

technology-enabled surveillance is becoming the standard form of care: I track you because I love you; I watch you to make sure you are safe. Outside the home, personal surveillance technologies are becoming the eyes on the street and the neighborhood watch that does away with imperfect human neighbors in favor of the camera's non-stop digital feed.

Beyond their use as practical tools for watching, however, these technologies are changing the way we think about ourselves and others as individuals and as members of communities. As much as the ability to monitor each other brings a sense of security, it can also provoke anxiety at being the object of surveillance everywhere. Alternatively, becoming comfortable with constant surveillance risks damaging the possibility of trust that has always been, and remains, a backbone of healthy relationships and communities.

注　highway underpass　高速道路の下を抜ける道路
racial profiling　警察官などが特定の人種や肌の色，言語などにもとづいて個人を捜査の対象とすること
Big Tech　情報技術産業におけるいくつかの巨大企業の総称
busybody　せんさく好きな人

1　下線部(1)が指す内容を 50 字以内の日本語(句読点を含む)で説明しなさい。

2　下線部(2)を和訳しなさい。

3　下線部(3)を和訳しなさい。

4　下線部(4)の内容を 60 字以内の日本語(句読点を含む)で説明しなさい。

5　現在の監視社会の技術的な状況がどのようになっているか，本文の内容に即して 60 字以内の日本語(句読点を含む)で説明しなさい。

Ⅱ　次の英文を読み，下の問いに答えなさい。（＊を付した語には，問題文の末尾に注がある。）

Charles Darwin enjoys a near god-like status among scientists for his theory of evolution. But his ideas that (1) animals are conscious in the same way humans are have long been ignored. Until now. "There is no fundamental difference between man and animals in their ability to feel pleasure and pain, happiness, and misery" Darwin wrote. But his suggestion that animals think and feel was seen as an unorthodox idea among many, (　A　) most animal behavior experts. The argument went that projecting human traits, feelings, and behaviors onto animals had no scientific basis and there (　あ　) animals' minds.

But if new evidence emerges of animals' abilities to feel and process what is going on (　ア　) them, could that mean they are, in fact, conscious? We now know that bees can count, recognize human faces, and learn how to use tools. Prof. Lars Chittka has worked on many of the major studies of bee intelligence. "If bees are that (I) intelligent, maybe they can think and feel something, which are the basic components of consciousness" he says. Prof. Chittka's experiments showed that bees would modify their behavior following a traumatic incident and seemed to be able to play, rolling small wooden balls, (　い　) entertainment.

These results have persuaded one of the most influential and respected scientists in animal research to make this strong, stark, and controversial statement: "(　B　) all the evidence that is on the table, it is quite likely that (II) bees are conscious".

It isn't just bees. Many say that it is now time to think again, (　イ　) the emergence of new evidence they say marks a dramatic change in thinking on the science of animal consciousness. They include Prof. Jonathan Birch. "We have researchers from different fields starting to dare to ask questions about animal consciousness and explicitly think about how their research might be relevant to those questions" says Prof. Birch.

Anyone looking for a sudden breakthrough will be disappointed. Instead, a steady growth of evidence for a rethink has led (ウ) conversations among the researchers involved. Now, many want a change in scientific thinking in the field. What has been discovered may not amount to conclusive proof of animal consciousness, but taken together, it is enough to suggest that there is "a realistic possibility" that (III) animals are capable of consciousness, according to Prof. Birch.

This applies not only to what are known as higher animals such as apes and dolphins who have reached a more advanced stage of development than other animals. It also applies to simpler creatures, such as snakes, octopuses, crabs, bees, and possibly even fruit flies, according to the group, who want funding for more research to determine whether animals are conscious, and if so, to what (2) extent.

But if you're wondering what (IV) we even mean by consciousness, you're not alone. It's something scientists can't even agree (エ). Some are very critical of some uses of the word consciousness. "The field is full of misleading vague terms and unfortunately one of those is consciousness" says Prof. Stevan Harnad. "It is a word that is confidently used by a lot of people, but they all mean something different, and so it is not clear at all what (V) it means".

Others who have been instinctively doubtful of the idea of animals being conscious say that (う) conscious makes a difference. Dr. Monique Udell, who was trained as a behaviorist*, says, "If we look at distinct behaviors, for example what (VI) species can recognize themselves in a mirror, how many can plan ahead or are able to remember things that happened in the past, we are able to test these questions with experimentation and observation and draw more accurate conclusions based on data. And if we are going to define consciousness as a sum of measurable behaviors, then animals that have succeeded in these particular tasks can be said to have something that (VII) we choose to call consciousness".

This is a much narrower definition of consciousness than the new group is promoting, but a respectful clash of ideas is what (Ⅷ) science is all about, according to Dr. Udell.

Kristin Andrews, a professor of philosophy specializing in animal minds, and many other scientists believe that research on humans and monkeys is the study of higher level consciousness — exhibited in the ability to communicate and feel complex emotions —(C) an octopus or snake may also have a more basic level of consciousness that we are ignoring by not investigating it.

注　behaviorist　行動主義心理学者

1　下線部(1)と同じ用法の that を本文中の波線部(Ⅰ)(Ⅱ)(Ⅲ)(Ⅶ)から一つ選び，そのローマ数字を解答欄に書きなさい。

2　下線部(2)と同じ用法の what を本文中の波線部(Ⅳ)(Ⅴ)(Ⅵ)(Ⅷ)から一つ選び，そのローマ数字を解答欄に書きなさい。

3　空欄(A)—(C)に入れるのに最も適した語句を次の中から一つ選び，その記号を解答欄に書きなさい。

(A)	イ	although	ロ	at best	ハ	if not	ニ	nonetheless
(B)	イ	Apart from	ロ	But for	ハ	Despite	ニ	Given
(C)	イ	if and when	ロ	in case	ハ	unlike	ニ	whereas

4　空欄(あ)に入れるものとして，以下の語を最も適切な順に並べ替えたとき，3番目と6番目に来る語の記号をそれぞれ解答欄に書きなさい。

イ	goes	ロ	in	ハ	no	ニ	of	ホ	on
ヘ	testing	ト	was	チ	way	リ	what		

5　空欄(　い　)に入れるものとして，以下の語を最も適切な順に並べ替えたとき，3番目と6番目に来る語の記号をそれぞれ解答欄に書きなさい。

イ　appeared	ロ　as	ハ　enjoy
ニ　they	ホ　to	ヘ　which

6　空欄(　う　)に入れるものとして，以下の語を最も適切な順に並べ替えたとき，3番目と6番目に来る語の記号をそれぞれ解答欄に書きなさい。

イ　be	ロ　broader	ハ　interpretation
ニ　it	ホ　means	ヘ　of
ト　the	チ　to	リ　what

7　空欄(　ア　)—(　エ　)に入れるのに最も適した語を次の中から1つ選び，その数字を解答欄に書きなさい。ただし，同じ語が2つ以上の空欄に入ることはない。

1　around　　2　into　　3　on　　4　to　　5　with

Ⅲ Choose one of the questions below and answer it in English. Your answer should be 100 to 140 words in length. Indicate the number of the question you have chosen. *Correctly* indicate the number of words you have written at the end of the composition.

1 You are a parent. Your child is experiencing some problems at school, and you want to discuss these problems and some solutions with the principal. Write a message to the principal, requesting a meeting.

2 You are a high school student. The park near your school is old, and you and your classmates would like to raise money for repairs. Write a message to the local businesses, requesting a donation.

3 You are a university student. You are planning your first solo trip abroad. You have a friend who has travelled to many countries alone. Write a message to your friend, requesting advice on how to prepare.