Sensorveiledning eksamen i POL 1001 våren 2010.

Eksamensoppgaven var:

**Politisk teori**

Svar på to av de følgende spørsmålene:

1. Sammenlikn synet til Bodin og Hobbes på suverenitet
4. Sammenlikn synet til Hegel og Locke om hensikten(e) med samfunnsstyre og verdien av frihet, frihetens sfære og natur.

**Politisk atferd**

1. Diskuter kort disse begrepene (maksimalt en side pr. begrep):
   a. Politisk tillit
   b. Relativ deprivasjon
   c. Politikkens medialisering
   d. Stemmeparadokset

2. Svar på en av de følgende oppgavene:
Politisk teori

Oppgave 1

When it comes to sovereignty, Bodin and Hobbes are worlds apart. Both of them recognize that Natural Law is real, but Bodin places Natural Law and Divine Law outside and above the sovereign, so that the sovereign is not in a position to interpret it in his own way, while Hobbes claims that Natural Law does not interpret itself, with the result that someone must be authorized to interpret Natural Law for the entire kingdom. This, says Hobbes, can only be the sovereign and this, in turn, has the result that the sovereign, whether the king or the Lord Protector, ends up above Natural Law, enjoying sovereignty (which is to say legitimate authority) which looks a great deal less limited or hemmed in than it does in Bodin’s view. Bodin also brings in custom, which he believes the sovereign must take into account, as well as the king’s oath. Bodin believes that a ruler is “sovereign” only to the extent that he (or she) is just, as defined by Natural Law, whereas Hobbes writes that “Just and unjust did not exist until commands were given; hence their nature is relative to a command.” Bodin also demanded that the sovereign respect all covenants into which he entered and respect the inviolability of private property, whereas Hobbes does not concede any such limitations. Bodin also argued that the king had no right to tax citizens without their consent – another limitation on his sovereignty – whereas Hobbes argued that the king had the right, without consulting his subjects, to whatever revenues (i.e., taxes) he needed. Bodin believed that he was upholding absolute sovereignty, but in his view this signified only that the king enjoyed “freedom in relation to positive laws, and not in relation to the laws of God...” Moreover, when it came to religion, Bodin pleaded for a limited form of religious toleration, in which both Catholics and Huegenots should tolerate each other, while Hobbes, in asserting his own brand of absolute sovereignty, held that the king could dictate in matters of religious creed and ritual.

Oppgave 2

St. Thomas Aquinas and Jeremy Bentham have fundamentally different views about both the purpose of the state and the nature of morality. For Aquinas, the purpose of the state is to work for the common good but this he understands as embracing not only the material welfare of people but also their spiritual welfare. For him, the common good took a priority over what was good for any single individual, and “the common good was greater than that of the individual.” But, as long as the government pursued the common good, it did matter whether it was a monarchy or an aristocratic government or a mixed system, although his preference was
for a limited monarchy. When it comes to Natural Law, he argues that “truth or rightness is the same for all men, and is equally known to all,” at least where the “general principles of reason” are concerned. Rulers must respect Natural Law, Aquinas asserts and, where they do not, their commands should not be obeyed. Moreover, the validity of the moral law does not depend on God’s command; God commands obedience to the moral law because it is binding, rather than the other way around. Aquinas’ moral thinking may, thus, be classified as moral universalism. Bentham, by contrast, believed that the purpose of government was to produce and promote as much happiness for people as possible; in McClelland’s words, for Bentham, government was supposed to function as “a happiness-producing agency.” Bentham advocated democracy and active government, and is remembered for his slogan championing “the greatest good for the greatest number”. For Bentham, there is no “common good” greater than the sum of what is good for each individual; hence, calculating what is good for the general public becomes, for Bentham, a mathematical exercise to tally up which policies make the most people the most happy. This normative orientation to promote happiness in turn led Bentham to embrace moral consequentialism, the view that what is good does not depend on its relationship to the dictates of reason (the view advocated by moral universalists, who look to Natural Law) but on what makes the most people the most happy, while respecting that happiness should not be promoted at the expense of actively inflicting suffering on people.

Oppgave 3

Plato and Marx were both fundamentally concerned about justice. For Plato, justice translated into a good division of labor, in which each person did the job for which he or she was most qualified; Plato believed that some people had the talent to rule, some had the talent to serve in what we would today call the security forces, and some people had other talents, whether making pots or writing poetry or singing or something else. He called the people meant to rule Guardians and the people assuring security Warriors. He said that one could use a myth of metals to interpret the Guardians as being people of “gold”, the Warriors as being people of “silver”, and everyone else as “bronze”. It was important to maintain a strict class system for Plato and not allow people to move from one class to another unless they demonstrated that they belonged in a higher or lower class (something which he believed should be determined during their childhood). The Guardians and Warriors lived without any wealth or private property of any note (they owned their own clothes and writing implements, of course) and took meals in collective mess halls; in this way, they were living in a kind of “communist” system. For the rabble (the people of bronze), Plato did not really care so much how they lived, just as long as they did not make trouble. Plato calculated that the ideal number of households
in a community was 5,040 and did not want the city to grow larger than that, or shrink. He also advocated eugenics and called for babies born with physical or mental afflictions to be drowned. Again, where the Guardians and Warriors were concerned, Plato believed that they should not know who their children were, and that their children should be raised by professionals. Marx, by contrast, wanted communism for everyone, thought that common mess halls with collective dining would be so attractive that very few persons would even want to make their own meals in his ideal system; he also thought in terms of children being raised by professionals, although he mentioned this only once, more or less in passing. Marx, of course, was against the class system and thought that one could construct a classless society. While Plato thought that one could create an “ideal” state, Marx thought that the state could only ever function as an instrument of oppression and exploitation, fostering alienation, and therefore believed that, in the ideal communist paradise, there would be no state, no government, no police, just people being friendly and cooperative. Again, while Plato thought that people should stick to what they are good at and mocked the idea that people would diversify their activities, Marx thought that, in an ideal world, one could, as he put it, raise sheep in the morning, fish in the afternoon, and work as a literary critic in the evening. When it comes to the concept of justice, Marx was ambiguous. Sometimes he claimed that every notion of justice has always been class-based, so that one could speak of the justice of a slave-owning society, of bourgeois justice, and of proletarian justice, but not of justice in itself. But, at other times, when he thought of the future communist society – about which he never offered more than vague hints – he seemed to hold out some promise of something better since, once there will be no classes, whatever justice exists cannot be class-based. For Plato, of course, one can speak of justice in itself.

Oppgave 4

For Locke, the purpose of government is to protect life and property, and, while the government should respect customary notions of rights and morality, it does not have the purpose of promoting morality or spiritual welfare; that said, he argued for a limited notion of religious toleration (to embrace all Protestant denominations), at a time when religious toleration was something new and controversial. Locke’s concept of freedom emphasized the individual and was focused on acquisition, whether of land or of some other goods. He argued that, provided there was enough left over for others, one was entitled to seize and own as much land as one wanted. He also defended the colonization of North America on the argument that the locals (the Amerindians) were living in a “state of nature” in which there was no government (which was not true). Hegel, who has frequently been misunderstood, was part of the liberal tradition; he believed that the kind of freedom which one might enjoy in the woods, far away from government, was uncertain, leaving one vulnerable, and that, in such a
condition (which Locke called the “state of nature”), any notion of real freedom was an illusion. Accordingly, one of the purposes of the state was to assure the kind of security in which people could maximize their real freedom. He further asserted, consistently, that the state’s regulation of the lives of citizens should be limited to what was necessary for the state to function and for the defense of the homeland. Although Hegel, like Locke, felt that the freedom of individuals was important, he did not believe that the state existed to serve the interests of individuals or that it could be understood as some sort of contract (as Locke had written): for Hegel, both of these claims are based on fallacious thinking. Hegel believed that the main purpose of the state was to promote and guarantee the ethical life of the community. Hegel was less concerned than Locke about the acquisition of property or about property rights, and more concerned about the relationship between freedom and one’s duties to the state and to fellow citizens and emphasized that no one had the right to cite religious faith for the purpose of shirking civic duty.

Politisk atferd.

Spørsmålene 1a til 1d er “lekshøring”. Studenter som skal komme i betraktning for bedre karakter enn C, bør ikke avsløre “hull” i pensum på disse spørsmålene. Hvis studenter som ikke klarer å svare akseptabelt på spørsmålene 1a til 1d velger oppgave 2b, er det særlig viktig å vurdere om de bruker faglig forankrede argumenter i 2b. I essayet (2a eller 2b) er det meningen at studentene skal vise evne til å bruke relevant pensumkunnskap. De studentene som har bearbeidet pensumstoffet og ikke bare lest det, bør kunne løfte besvarelsen ut over det rene pensumreferatet her.

Oppgave 1a.

Oppgave 1b.

Begrepet relativ deprivasjon har mange studenter trolig møtt allerede på POL 1000 (Østeruds bok). På POL 1001 pensumet er det presentert i et notat som ble lagt ut på It’s learning. Relativ deprivasjon er et resultat av at forventninger ikke innfries. Vanlige årsaker er at en sammenlikner seg med referansegrupper med bedre levekår, at forventninger til forbedrede levekår uteblir, etc. Studenter som har lest pensum, vil kanskje trekke inn Stouffer et. al. The American Soldier som eksempel og faglig opprinnelse. Ideen er naturligvis mye eldre, men det er imidlertid ikke uvanlig at Stouffer krediteres. Dyktige studenter knytter begrepet til Aardals tolking av valgene i 2001 og 2005: den sittende regjering falt på grunn av ”stigende forventnings misnøye”.

Oppgave 1c.

Begrepet ”Politikkens medialisering” står sentralt i pensumboka Den medialiserte politikken (Jenssen & Allberg red.). Begrepet refererer til maktforskyvningen fra den politiske sfære til mediene. Kenneth Asps argument er at politikerne og de politiske institusjonene har måttet tilpasse seg medienes logikk i en grad som overfører makt. Asp trekker også inn Hernes sitt medievridningsbegrep som en komponent i politikkens medialisering. Jenssen og Aalberg argumenterer at mediene har skaffet seg regimakt. Det er mediene som iscenesetter den politiske offentligheten med dagsorden og konfliktmønster.

Oppgave 1d.

Stemmeparadokset (“paradox of voting”) er presentert i pensumartikkelen: Decline of electoral turnout. The case of Norway (Narud & Valen) og bokkapitlet Demokrati og valgdeltakelse – en innføring og oversikt (Aardal). Temaet er også grundig gjennomgått på forelesning. Stemmeparadokset, som ble beskrevet allerede av Downs, sier at fordi sjansen (P) for at en aktørs stemme skal avgjøre valget er ubetydelig, vil kostnaden (C) ved å stemme alltid være større enn den forventede nytten: C > P*B. Den rasjonelle aktøren vil derfor ikke stemme. Dyktige studenter har fått med seg noen av de tenkelige løsningsforslagene slik som C < P*B + D, der D står for psykologisk tilfredsstillelse knyttet til plikt (duty) (Riker & Ordeshook) eller forestillingen om at folk stemmer for å minimalisere det maksimale tapet. Disse er nevnt hos Narud & Valen
Oppgave 2a.

Vi stiller krav om fruktbarhet, realisme og tankeøkonomi. I pensum er dette med i paperet *Om fruktbarhet og realisme i valgmodeller* (Jenssen). Innholdet i de tre kravene må forklares. De som har lest pensum vil kunne bruke begrepet "kausal avstand" for å forklare hva de legger i kravet om fruktbarhet. Temaet er gjennomgått på forelesning med eksempler og burde ikke være spesielt vanskelig for dem som har fulgt med i timen. Hovedpoenget er naturligvis at studentene forstår at enhver modell representerer en forenkling og at ingen modeller derfor pretenderer å utsi den hele og fulle sannhet om den empiriske virkeligheten. Modeller er arbeidsverktøy på teorinivå. Litt mer krevende kan det kanskje være å drøfte hvordan de tre kravene skal avveies mot hverandre, men også dette er diskutert på forelesning. De tre klassiske valgmodellene er klassifisert i forhold til de tre kriteriene.

Oppgave 2b.