

Вопрос **Инфо**

Уважаемые участники!

Олимпиадное задание по направлению «Международные отношения» состоит только из двух частей с задачами, обязательными для выполнения. Это означает, что вам нужно попробовать успешно справиться с обеими частями, чтобы претендовать на призовые места.

**Общая часть** предполагает единое задание для всех участников.

**Специальная часть** состоит из трёх блоков, среди которых нужно выбрать **только один**. Выполнение заданий двух и более блоков **не принесёт** вам дополнительных баллов.

При выполнении заданий вы можете пользоваться любыми онлайн-словарями и онлайн-переводчиками. Использование черновиков и справочных материалов строго запрещено.

Верим в ваш успех!

Вопрос 1

Балл: 40,00

## I. ОБЩАЯ ЧАСТЬ

**Прочтите текст, изложите основные идеи автора и дайте их оценку (на русском языке)**

Vol 1

### UTOPIA AND REALITY

The antithesis of Utopia and reality — a balance always swinging towards and away from equilibrium and never completely attaining it — is a fundamental antithesis revealing itself in many forms of thought. The two methods of approach — the inclination to ignore what was and what is in contemplation of what should be, and the inclination to deduce what should be from what was and what is — determine opposite attitudes towards every political problem. "It is the eternal dispute", as Albert Sorel puts it, "between those who imagine the world to suit their policy, and those who arrange their policy to suit the realities of the world." It may be suggestive to elaborate this antithesis before proceeding to an examination of the current crisis of international politics.

### Theory and Practice

The antithesis of utopia and reality coincides with the antithesis of theory and practice. The utopian makes political theory a norm to which political practice ought to conform. The realist regards political theory as a sort of codification of political practice. The relationship of theory and practice has come to be recognised in recent years as one of the central problems of political thought. Both the utopian and the realist distort this relationship. The utopian, purporting to recognise the interdependence of purpose and fact, treats purpose as if it were the only relevant fact, and constantly couches optative propositions in the indicative mood. The American Declaration of Independence maintains that "all men are created equal", Mr. Litvinov that "peace is indivisible", and Sir Norman Angell that "the biological division of mankind into independent warring states" is a "scientific ineptitude". Yet it is a matter of common observation that all men are not born equal even in the United States, and that the Soviet Union can remain at peace while its neighbours are at war;

and we should probably think little of a zoologist who described a man-eating tiger as a "scientific ineptitude". These propositions are items in a political programme disguised as statements of fact; and the utopian inhabits a dream-world of such "facts", remote from the world of reality where quite contrary facts may be observed. The realist has no difficulty in perceiving that these utopian propositions are not facts but aspirations, and belong to the optative not to the indicative mood; and he goes on to shew that, considered as aspirations, they are not a priori propositions, but are rooted in the world of reality in a way which the utopian altogether fails to understand. Thus for the realist, the equality of man is the ideology of the under-privileged seeking to raise themselves to the level of the privileged; the indivisibility of peace the ideology of states which, being particularly exposed to attack, are eager to establish the principle that an attack on them is a matter of concern to other states more fortunately situated; the ineptitude of sovereign states the ideology of predominant Powers which find the sovereignty of other states a barrier to the enjoyment of their own predominant position. This exposure of the hidden foundations of utopian theory is a necessary preliminary to any serious political science. But the realist, in denying any a priori quality to political theories, and in proving them to be rooted in practice, falls easily into a determinism which argues that theory, being nothing more than a rationalisation of conditioned and predetermined purpose, is a pure excrescence and impotent to alter the course of events. While therefore the utopian treats purpose as the sole ultimate fact, the realist runs the risk of treating purpose merely as the mechanical product of other facts. If we recognise that this mechanisation of human will and human aspiration is untenable and intolerable, then we must recognise that theory, as it develops out of practice and develops into practice, plays its own transforming role in the process. The political process does not consist, as the realist believes, purely in a succession of phenomena governed by mechanical laws of causation; nor does it consist, as the Utopian believes, purely in the application to practice of certain theoretical truths evolved out of their inner consciousness by wise and far-seeing people. Political science must be based on a recognition of the interdependence of theory and practice, which can be attained only through a combination of Utopia and reality.

Vol 2

#### UTOPIA AND REALITY

The antithesis of Utopia and reality — a balance always swinging towards and away from equilibrium and never completely attaining it — is a fundamental antithesis revealing itself in many forms of thought. The two methods of approach — the inclination to ignore what was and what is in contemplation of what should be, and the inclination to deduce what should be from what was and what is — determine opposite attitudes towards every political problem. "It is the eternal dispute", as Albert Sorel puts it, "between those who imagine the world to suit their policy, and those who arrange their policy to suit the realities of the world." It may be suggestive to elaborate this antithesis before proceeding to an examination of the current crisis of international politics.

#### Left and Right

The antithesis of Utopia and reality reproduces itself in the antithesis of radical and conservative, of Left and Right, though it would be rash to assume that parties carrying these labels always represent these underlying tendencies. The radical is necessarily utopian, and the conservative realist. The intellectual, the man of theory, will gravitate towards the Left just as naturally as the bureaucrat, the man of practice, will gravitate towards the Right. Hence the Right is weak in theory, and suffers through its inaccessibility to ideas. The characteristic weakness of the Left is failure to translate its theory into practice — a failure for which it is apt to blame the bureaucrats, but which is inherent in its utopian character. "The Left has reason (Vernunft), the Right has wisdom (Verstand)", wrote the Nazi philosopher, Moeller van den Bruck. From the days of Burke onwards, English conservatives have always strongly denied the possibility of deducing political practice by a logical process from political theory. "To follow the syllogism alone is a short cut to the bottomless pit", says Lord Baldwin — a phrase which may suggest that he practises as well as preaches abstention from rigorously logical modes of thought. Mr. Churchill refuses to believe that "extravagant logic in doctrine" appeals to the British elector. A particularly clear definition of different attitudes towards foreign policy comes from a speech made in the House of Commons by Neville Chamberlain in answer to a Labour critic:

What does the hon. Member mean by foreign policy? You can lay down sound and general propositions. You can say that your foreign policy is to maintain peace; you can say that it is to protect British interests, you can say that it is to use your influence, such as it is, on behalf of the right against the wrong, as far as you can tell the right from the wrong. You can lay down all these

## Международные отношения

general principles, but that is not a policy. Surely, if you are to have a policy you must take the particular situations and consider what action or inaction is suitable for those particular situations. That is what I myself mean by policy, and it is quite clear that as the situations and conditions in foreign affairs continually change from day to day, your policy cannot be stated once and for all, if it is to be applicable to every situation that arises.

The intellectual superiority of the Left is seldom in doubt. The Left alone thinks out principles of political action and evolves ideals for statesmen to aim at. But it lacks practical experience which comes from close contact with reality. In Great Britain after 1919, it was a serious misfortune that the Left, having enjoyed office for negligible periods, had little experience of administrative realities and became more and more a party of pure theory, while the Right, having spent so little time in opposition, had few temptations to pit the perfection of theory against the imperfections of practice. In Soviet Russia, the group in power is more and more discarding theory in favour of practice as it loses the memory of its revolutionary origin. History everywhere shews that, when Left parties or politicians are brought into contact with reality through the assumption of political office, they tend to abandon their "doctrinaire" utopianism and move towards the Right, often retaining their Left labels and thereby adding to the confusion of political terminology.

Вопрос 2

Балл: 60,00

## II. СПЕЦИАЛЬНАЯ ЧАСТЬ

Выберите и выполните **только один** из блоков заданий специальной части

**Блок 1. Европейские и российские исследования.** Дайте развернутые ответы:

1. Внешняя политика СССР и завершение холодной войны в Европе (1985 – 1991).
2. Идеиные истоки европейской интеграции.

**Блок 2. Азиатские исследования.** Дайте развернутые ответы:

1. Политика реформ и открытости Дэн Сяопина.
2. Вторая мировая война в Азии.

**Блок 3. Ближний Восток и Северная Африка.** Дайте развернутые ответы:

1. Идеи арабского национализма и их влияние на политическую историю стран Ближнего Востока и Северной Африки в XX веке.
2. Политическая биография Мустафы Кемаля Ататюрка и его место в истории Турецкой Республики.