

2024학년도 연세대학교 면접시험

특기자전형[국제인재] 인문 · 사회

Instructions. Please read the passages and answer the following questions. Question 1 is worth 60% and question 2 is worth 40% of your final score.

Passage 1

Socrates: What is justice?

Thrasymachus: Justice is what is in the interest of the strong. Whatever form of government there is, it serves the interests of the rulers. The rulers are the strongest people in a country. They make laws to maintain their interests. The subjects must obey these laws. If they break them, they have acted “wrongly” and must be punished. So, justice is what is in the interest of the strong.

Socrates: But the interest of a ruler as ruler is not to benefit himself but to benefit his subjects.

Thrasymachus: How so?

Socrates: Consider a doctor practicing medicine. Is the interest of the doctor as doctor to benefit himself, or is it to benefit his patients? Or consider a ship’s captain. Is his interest as captain to benefit himself, or is it to benefit his ship and crew?

Thrasymachus: Well then, consider a shepherd. He does not feed and look after his sheep for the benefit of the sheep, but for his own benefit, as he wants to eat the sheep or sell them for money.

Socrates: But then you are considering the shepherd not as a shepherd but as a diner or as a businessman. The interest of the shepherd as a shepherd is to look after his sheep.

Question 1

- a) If you were Thrasymachus, how would you respond to Socrates?
- b) It is possible to argue for one country ruling over another (as sometimes happens in empires) through both Thrasymachus’ and Socrates’ positions. What are these two arguments? Why might they fail to justify imperialism*?

*imperialism = 제국주의

Passage 2

William Bentinck (Colonial Governor of India) on the Banning of *Sati**, 8th November 1829

In considering the question of whether or not to ban the practice of *sati*, there is a big responsibility. To allow hundreds of innocent women to die every year, when we have the power to stop it, is something that would hurt our conscience. But on the other hand, if we tried to ban it, this would risk the safety of the British Empire in India.

It is the honest ambition of the Government of India, of which I form a part, that we should have the credit of cleaning a dirty spot on British rule by preventing the unjust sacrifice of human lives rather than doing nothing, even though that would be more convenient. I feel anxious that we choose to follow the good example set to us by the British Government at home, and adopt the same high principles in India. By doing so we would bring honor to our nation.

**sati* = the Hindu (힌두) ritual practice of women voluntarily burning themselves alive when their husbands died to achieve a higher place in heaven for both of them.

Question 2

- a) William Bentinck was criticized for banning *sati* as this was considered an unacceptable application of Western moral standards on a different culture. Do you agree?
- b) Of the two ideas of justice considered in Passage 1, which of these most applies to the case of Bentinck? Explain your answer.