慶應義塾大学

経済学部 2/13

英語

入印		II		III	
		10.	3	24.	3
Ι		11.	3	25.	1
1.	4	12.	3	26.	2
2.	1	13.	2	27.	<u>1</u>
3.	2	14.	2	28.	4
4.	4	15.	1	29.	4
5.	3	16.	4	30.	2
6.	4	17.	2	31.	6
7.	2	18.	1	32.	5
8.	4	19.	<u>1</u>	33.	<u>1</u>
9.	4	20.	4	34.	2
		21.	4	35.	2
		22.	4	36.	2
		23.	2		

※<u>下線</u>…修正済



S1: No way! I just found a mistake this morning and now I'm rewriting it.

R2: Really? If you had told me earlier I could have helped you.

S2: I will handle it on my own for the time being, but I could use your help if I'm not done by noon.

V

(解答例)(A)の場合

I think that Japanese Government should not reduce funding for the Arts.

In his 2018 article "Government Support: A Tragedy for the Arts?", Bothur claims that "There are plenty of wealthy individuals who are prepared to support less famous but talented artists". She argues that this kind of patronage system has been around for centuries providing money and materials for the talented, aspiring artists and therefore it's not necessary for governments to be funding the Arts. However I strongly disagree with this statement, because this system only applies after someone gets into the art field but not for the potential artists who may have unleashed his/her talent if the government had funded the art community so that they could've had affordable access to art because childhood. In a poor neighborhood, it would be difficult for children to have an opportunity to be exposed to arts such as music and literature since those things are expensive and are not affordable for everyone to enjoy. Bothur did claim that artists flourish best when they are challenged, but this is not always the case and it is only backed up by one artist. Therefore, I think that Japanese Government reducing funding for the Arts will only take away opportunities from individuals that might have created a masterpiece, which is not something we want to see happen. (223 words)

