

**STUDIJNÍ PROGRAM SOCIOLOGIE**  
Vzorové otázky přijímacího testu

**BAKALÁŘSKÝ OBOR SOCIOLOGIE**

**1. Které z následujících tvrzení o Ústavním soudu České republiky je NEpravdivé:**

- 1) Funkční období každého ústavního soudce je 10 let
- 2) V roce 2012 byl předsedou Ústavního soudu ČR Pavel Rychetský
- 3) Soudce Ústavního soudu jmenuje prezident se souhlasem parlamentu

**2. Maastrichtská kritéria**

- 1) jsou kritéria pro vstup do Evropské unie
- 2) jsou kritéria pro členské státy Evropské unie pro vstup do Evropské hospodářské a měnové unie
- 3) jsou kritéria pro vstup do Rady bezpečnosti OSN

**3. Empirismus jako myšlenkový směr prosazuje:**

- 1) Smyslové zkušenosti jako jediný zdroj poznání
- 2) Snahu o vcítění se do situace jako zdroj možného poznání jednání lidí
- 3) Myšlenku, že podstatu věcí nikdy nemůžeme poznat

**4. Mezi tzv. otce zakladatele klasické sociologie NEpatří:**

- 1) Emile Durkheim
- 2) Max Weber
- 3) Ulrich Beck

**5. Odečtete mnohočlen  $b + 3a^2 - ab$  od mnohočlenu  $2a^2 + 3ab + b$ . Co je výsledkem?**

- 1)  $a^2 - 4ab$
- 2)  $5a^2 + 4ab$
- 3)  $-a^2 + 4ab$

**6. Co je řešením rovnice  $(2x - 3)^2 + 12x = 0$  v oboru reálných čísel?**

- 1)  $x_1 = \frac{3}{2}$  (rovnice má v definičním oboru jen jeden kořen)
- 2) Nemá řešení
- 3)  $x_1 = \frac{3}{2}, x_2 = -\frac{3}{2}$

Odpovědi:

- 1/3
- 2/2
- 3/1
- 4/3
- 5/3
- 6/2

## **Marches of Folly**

By PAUL KRUGMAN

Ten years ago, America invaded Iraq; somehow, our political class decided that we should respond to a terrorist attack by making war on a regime that, however vile, had nothing to do with that attack.

Some voices warned that we were making a terrible mistake — that the case for war was weak and possibly fraudulent, and that far from yielding the promised easy victory, the venture was all too likely to end in costly grief. And those warnings were, of course, right.

There were, it turned out, no weapons of mass destruction; it was obvious in retrospect that the Bush administration deliberately misled the nation into war. And the war — having cost thousands of American lives and scores of thousands of Iraqi lives, having imposed financial costs vastly higher than the war's boosters predicted — left America weaker, not stronger, and ended up creating an Iraqi regime that is closer to Tehran than it is to Washington.

So did our political elite and our news media learn from this experience? It sure doesn't look like it.

The really striking thing, during the run-up to the war, was the illusion of consensus. To this day, pundits who got it wrong excuse themselves on the grounds that "everyone" thought that there was a solid case for war. Of course, they acknowledge, there were war opponents — but they were out of the mainstream.

The trouble with this argument is that it was and is circular: support for the war became part of the definition of what it meant to hold a mainstream opinion. Anyone who dissented, no matter how qualified, was ipso facto labeled as unworthy of consideration. This was true in political circles; it was equally true of much of the press, which effectively took sides and joined the war party.

CNN's Howard Kurtz, who was at The Washington Post at the time, recently wrote about how this process worked, how skeptical reporting, no matter how solid, was discouraged and rejected. "Pieces questioning the evidence or rationale for war," he wrote, "were frequently buried, minimized or spiked."

Closely associated with this taking of sides was an exaggerated and inappropriate reverence for authority. Only people in positions of power were considered worthy of respect. Mr. Kurtz tells us, for example, that The Post killed a piece on war doubts by its own senior defense reporter on the grounds that it relied on retired military officials and outside experts — "in other words, those with sufficient independence to question the rationale for war."

All in all, it was an object lesson in the dangers of groupthink, a demonstration of how important it is to listen to skeptical voices and separate reporting from advocacy. But as I said, it's a lesson that doesn't seem to have been learned. (...)

### **Source:**

The New York Times, March 17, 2013

<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/18/opinion/krugman-marches-of-folly.html?hpw>

(18/03/13)

**Určete, zda jsou podle textu tvrzení uvedená v otázkách pravdivá, nepravdivá, nebo zda uvedená informace není v textu vůbec obsažená.**

- 1. Despite the sceptical and gloomy predictions about the impossibility of an easy victory, the war came to an end pretty soon.**
  - 1) True.
  - 2) False.
  - 3) Not given in the text.
  
- 2. Now, it appears that it was an intention of the Bush administration to mislead the nation into war.**
  - 1) True.
  - 2) False.
  - 3) Not given in the text.
  
- 3. Ten years ago, America responded to a terrorist attack by making war on a regime that was undoubtedly evil but had nothing to do with that attack.**
  - 1) True.
  - 2) False.
  - 3) Not given in the text.

Odpovědi:

1/2

2/1

3/1