

Е.Н. Захарова

DIPLOMATS AND DIPLOMACY

**учебно-методическое пособие
для направления подготовки «Международные отношения»
Института истории и международных отношений**

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Е.Н. Захарова

DIPLOMATS AND DIPLOMACY

*учебно-методическое пособие
для направления подготовки «Международные отношения»
Института истории и международных отношений*

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Саратов 2019 г.

Захарова Е.Н. Diplomats and Diplomacy. Учебно-методическое пособие для направления подготовки «Международные отношения» Института истории и международных отношений. – Саратов, 2019.

Учебно-методическое пособие содержит материалы для чтения профессионально-ориентированной литературы на иностранном языке (английский язык) для бакалавров и магистрантов направления «Международные отношения» Института истории и международных отношений. Все учебные тексты снабжены системой после-текстовых упражнений.

Целью пособия является подготовка студентов к работе с аутентичной академической литературой по специальности.

Работа издана в авторской редакции

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Предисловие	5
A Brief History of Diplomacy	6
Diplomatic Immunity	13
Qualifications of an Ambassador	19
Common Denominators of Good Ambassadors.....	28
The Makings of a Good Ambassador	38
A Diplomatic Mission.....	46

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

ПРЕДИСЛОВИЕ

Настоящее пособие предназначено для бакалавров и магистрантов направления «Международные отношения» Института истории и международных отношений в качестве материала для домашнего чтения и переводческого практикума. Учебным материалом пособия являются оригинальные тексты из англоязычного журнала, размещенного на портале международного дипломатического сообщества “E-Diplomat” <http://www.ediplomat.com>.

Целью пособия является подготовка студентов к самостоятельной работе с академической литературой и периодикой по специальности.

Учебные тексты снабжены системой после-текстовых упражнений и заданий для домашней работы. Это позволяет последовательно подвести студентов к пониманию и осмыслению содержания текстов, развивать навыки контекстуального подхода к переводу, ориентируют на пополнение индивидуального словарного запаса в процессе чтения. Перевод рассматривается автором как этап речевой деятельности, завершающий предварительный анализ и толкование содержания и ведущий к передаче смысла оригинала средствами родного языка.

Название: **“A Brief History of Diplomacy”**

Источник: <http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/history.htm>

The ability to practice diplomacy is one of the defining elements of a state, and diplomacy has been practiced since the formation of the first city-states. Originally diplomats were sent only for specific negotiations, and would return immediately after their mission concluded. Diplomats were usually relatives of the ruling family or of very high rank in order to give them legitimacy when they sought to negotiate with the other state.

One notable exception involved the relationship between the Pope and the Byzantine Emperor. Papal agents, called apocrisarii, were permanently resident in Constantinople. After the 8th century, however, conflicts between the Pope and the Emperor (such as the Iconoclastic controversy) led to the breaking down of these close ties.

Modern diplomacy's origins are often traced to the states of Northern Italy in the early Renaissance, with the first embassies being established in the thirteenth century. Milan played a leading role, especially under Francesco Sforza who established permanent embassies to the other cities states of Northern Italy. It was in Italy that many of the traditions of modern diplomacy began, such as the presentation of an ambassador's credentials to the head of state.

The practice spread from Italy to the other European powers. Milan was the first to send a representative to the court of France in 1455. Milan however refused to host French representatives fearing espionage and possible intervention in internal affairs. As foreign powers such as France and Spain became increasingly involved in Italian politics the need to accept emissaries was recognized. Soon all the major European powers were exchanging representatives. Spain was the first to send a permanent representative when it

appointed an ambassador to the Court of England in 1487. By the late 16th century, permanent missions became the standard.

Many of the conventions of modern diplomacy developed during this period. The top rank of representatives was an ambassador. An ambassador at this time was almost always a nobleman - the rank of the noble varied with the prestige of the country he was posted to. Defining standards emerged for ambassadors, requiring that they have large residences, host lavish parties, and play an important role in the court life of the host nation. In Rome, the most important post for Catholic ambassadors, the French and Spanish representatives sometimes maintained a retinue of up to a hundred people. Even in smaller posts, ambassadors could be very expensive. Smaller states would send and receive envoys who were one level below an ambassador.

Ambassadors from each state were ranked by complex codes of precedence that were much disputed. States were normally ranked by the title of the sovereign; for Catholic nations the emissary from the Vatican was paramount, then those from the kingdoms, then those from duchies and principalities. Representatives from republics were considered the lowest envoys.

Ambassadors at that time were nobles with little foreign or diplomatic experience and needed to be supported by a large embassy staff. These professionals were sent on longer assignments and were far more knowledgeable about the host country. Embassy staff consisted of a wide range of employees, including some dedicated to espionage. The need for skilled individuals to staff embassies was met by the graduates of universities, and this led to an increase in the study of international law, modern languages, and history at universities throughout Europe.

At the same time, permanent foreign ministries were established in almost all European states to coordinate embassies and their staffs. These ministries

were still far from their modern form. Many had extraneous internal responsibilities. Britain had two departments with frequently overlapping powers until 1782. These early foreign ministries were also much smaller. France, which boasted the largest foreign affairs department, had only 70 full-time employees in the 1780s.

The elements of modern diplomacy slowly spread to Eastern Europe and arrived in Russia by the early eighteenth century. The entire system was greatly disrupted by the French Revolution and the subsequent years of warfare. The revolution would see commoners take over the diplomacy of the French state, and of those conquered by revolutionary armies. Ranks of precedence were abolished. Napoleon also refused to acknowledge diplomatic immunity, imprisoning several British diplomats accused of scheming against France. He had no patience for the often slow moving process of formal diplomacy.

After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna of 1815 established an international system of diplomatic rank. Disputes on precedence among nations (and the appropriate diplomatic ranks used) persisted for over a century until after World War II, when the rank of ambassador became the norm.

Exercise 1: Use context clues to get the meaning of the words/phrases and give their Russian equivalents.

to practice diplomacy, negotiations, to give them legitimacy, notable exception, permanent embassies, an ambassador's credentials, it appointed an ambassador to, a nobleman, the host nation, envoys, codes of precedence, a large embassy staff, knowledgeable, dedicated to espionage, extraneous internal responsibilities, full-time employees, revolutionary armies, to abolish, refused to acknowledge, disputes

Exercise 2: Read the statements below and determine whether they are true or false. If the statement is false, correct it.

1. Originally diplomats were sent only for specific negotiations, and would return immediately after their mission concluded.
2. After the 8th century, however, conflicts between the Pope and noblemen (such as the Iconoclastic controversy) led to the breaking down of these very distant ties.
3. It was in the UK that many of the traditions of modern diplomacy began, such as the presentation of an ambassador's credentials to the head of state.
4. As foreign powers such as France and Spain became increasingly involved in Italian politics the need to accept emissaries was recognized.
5. In Rome, the most important post for Orthodox ambassadors, the French and Spanish representatives sometimes maintained a retinue of up to a thousand people.
6. Representatives from republics were considered the lowest envoys.

7. The need for skilled individuals to staff embassies was met by the Professors of universities, and this led to an increase in the study of international law, ancient languages, and geography at universities throughout Europe.
8. Britain had two departments with frequently overlapping powers until 1782.
9. The elements of modern diplomacy slowly spread to Eastern Europe and arrived in Russia by the early eighteenth century.
10. After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna of 1915 established an intercultural system of diplomatic rank.

Exercise 3: Translate the text into English.

Дипломатия как метод урегулирования установления отношений между группами людей существовала, очевидно, ещё в доисторические времена. Ещё в XVI веке теоретики уверяли, что первыми дипломатами были ангелы, так как они исполняли обязанности послов между небом и землей.

Даже в доисторические времена, вполне вероятно, бывали случаи, когда одно племя воевало с другим племенем и для того, чтобы подобрать раненых и похоронить убитых, велись переговоры о временном прекращении битвы. Уже тогда было ясно, что подобного рода переговоры были бы невозможны, если бы посол одной стороны был съеден другой стороной до того, как он передал послание. Отсюда, вероятно, и появились определённые права и привилегии для переговорщиков. Личность подобного рода посланцев или вестников, надлежащим образом уполномоченных, должна была быть в некотором отношении особой. Из

этих обычаев возникли те привилегии, которыми пользуются современные дипломаты.

В рабовладельческом обществе, постоянно использовавшем военные захваты для пополнения рабочей силы, преобладали военные средства осуществления внешней политики государств. Дипломатические связи поддерживались лишь эпизодически посольствами, которые направлялись в отдельные страны с определённой миссией и возвращались после её выполнения.

В условиях феодальной раздробленности получила распространение «частная» дипломатия феодальных суверенов, которые в промежутках между войнами заключали мирные договоры, вступали в военные союзы, устраивали династические браки. Широкие дипломатические связи поддерживала Византия. В середине XV века с развитием международных отношений постепенно появляются постоянные представительства государств за границей.

Особенности дипломатии государств новой истории определяются новыми целями их внешней политики в условиях развития капиталистического (рыночного) хозяйства. Для крупных государств это борьба за завоевание внешних рынков, за раздел, а затем и за передел мира. Для небольших государств и народов - это формирование национальных государств, отстаивание их независимости и целостности.

В новых условиях значительно расширяются масштабы дипломатической деятельности, которая становится более динамичной и используется государством для создания более широкой опоры среди руководства и правящей элиты иностранных государств, для установления контактов с определёнными политическими партиями, СМИ. Дипломатия, наряду с военными средствами, сыграла важную роль в борьбе за осуществление целей антифеодальных, демократических и национально-

освободительных движений, в образовании национальных государств в Латинской Америке и на Балканах, в объединении Германии, Италии. В новейшей истории новым важнейшим направлением дипломатии стало сохранение мира, развитие многообразных переговорных форматов, создание наднациональных регулирующих органов - Лига Наций, ООН, G8, G20.

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Название: “**Diplomatic Immunity**”

Источник: http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/diplomatic_immunity.htm

Diplomatic immunity is a principle of international law by which certain foreign government officials are not subject to the jurisdiction of local courts and other authorities. The concept of immunity began with ancient tribes. In order to exchange information, messengers were allowed to travel from tribe to tribe without fear of harm. They were protected even when they brought bad news. Today, immunity protects the channels of diplomatic communication by exempting diplomats from local jurisdiction so that they can perform their duties with freedom, independence, and security. Diplomatic immunity is not meant to benefit individuals personally; it is meant to ensure that foreign officials can do their jobs. Under the concept of reciprocity, diplomats assigned to any country in the world benefit equally from diplomatic immunity.

The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963 codified most modern diplomatic and consular practices, including diplomatic immunity. More than 160 nations are parties to these treaties. The conventions provide immunity to persons according to their rank in a diplomatic mission or consular post and according to the need for immunity in performing their duties. For example, diplomatic agents and members of their immediate families are immune from all criminal prosecution and most civil law suits. Administrative and technical staff members of embassies have a lower level of immunity. Consular officers serving in consulates throughout the country have an even lower level of immunity. Members of an embassy's service staff and consular employees are immune only for acts performed as part of their official duties

It is true that diplomats are exempt from the criminal, civil and administrative jurisdiction of the host country. However, this exemption may be waived by their home country. Moreover, the immunity of a diplomat from the jurisdiction of the host country does not exempt him/her from the jurisdiction of his/her home country.

It is also within the discretion of the host country to declare any member of the diplomatic staff of a mission *persona non grata* (or unwanted person). This may be done at any time and there is no obligation to explain such a decision. In these situations, the home country, as a rule, would recall the person or terminate his/her function with the mission.

The Vienna Convention provides for specific measures that can be taken by both the home and host countries in cases of misuse or abuse of diplomatic privileges and immunities. On the whole, diplomatic privileges and immunities have served as efficient tools facilitating relations between States. No UN Member State has so far proposed rescinding the Convention or re-writing its provisions.

Diplomatic privileges and immunities guarantee that diplomatic agents or members of their immediate family:

May not be arrested or detained

May not have their residences entered and searched

May not be subpoenaed as witnesses

May not be prosecuted

Exercise 1: Use context clues to get the meaning of the words/phrases and give their Russian equivalents. Make up sentences of your own using these words/phrases.

a principle of international law, subject to the jurisdiction of local courts and other authorities, without fear of harm, the channels of diplomatic communication, perform their duties, to benefit, reciprocity, consular post, members of their immediate families, criminal prosecution, this exemption, to declare persona non grata, as a rule, terminate his/her function, specific measures, diplomatic privileges and immunities, efficient, witnesses

Exercise 2: Read the statements below and determine whether they are true or false. If the statement is false, correct it.

1. The concept of immunity began with ancient times. In order to exchange information, messengers were allowed to travel from time to time without fear of harm.
2. Diplomatic immunity is not meant to benefit individuals personally; it is meant to ensure that foreign officials can do their jobs.
3. More than 180 nations are parties to these treaties. The conventions provide immunity to persons not according to their rank in a diplomatic mission or consular post but according to the need for immunity in performing their duties.

4. Consular officers serving in consulates throughout the country have an even lower level of immunity. Members of an embassy's service staff and consular employees are immune only for acts performed as part of their official duties
5. It is true that immediate families are exempt from the criminal, civil and administrative jurisdiction of the host country.
6. The Vienna Convention provides for specific measures that can be taken by both the home and host countries in cases of misuse or abuse of diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Exercise 3: Translate the text into English.

В некотором виде данный институт существовал еще в древности. В Древнем Китае, древнегреческих полисах и древнеиндийских государствах личность послов считалась неприкосновенной. В Древней Индии пользовались неприкосновенностью также и посольские помещения. В тот период это было обусловлено, прежде всего, религиозными верованиями. Кроме того, в указанных государствах царила стойкая убежденность в том, что обеспечить мирные международные отношения и взаимодействие друг с другом по различным вопросам невозможно без предоставления иностранным послам и посредникам права безопасно передвигаться по территориям государств пребывания. Вместе с тем принцип личной неприкосновенности послов утратил былое значение в период расцвета Римской Империи, а позднее Византии — оба эти государства больше полагались на захватническую политику, нежели мирное сосуществование.

В современном смысле слова дипломатия возродилась лишь в конце средневековья, на заре Ренессанса. С появлением в XV веке постоянных посольских учреждений укрепился принцип неприкосновенности их

помещений. С учетом особой роли церкви в рассматриваемый исторический период послы, продолжая пользоваться неприкосновенностью, стали считаться находящимися под её особым покровительством. В XVI веке — период ожесточённой религиозной розни — в практику государств вошли особая защита и иммунитет от уголовной юрисдикции послов, включая даже тех, которые подозревались в заговоре против аккредитовавших их суверенов. В данном контексте уместно сослаться на такой дипломатический казус. Испанский посол Мендоса в 1584 году был обвинён английским правительством в заговоре, имевшем целью свергнуть английскую королеву Елизавету. При этом возник вопрос, можно ли судить испанского посла в английском суде. Совет Королевы обратился за консультацией к известному итальянскому дипломату, правоведа, знатоку дипломатического права Альберико Джентили (автор трактата «Три книги о посольствах» 1585 г.). Тот дал заключение, что Мендоса должен быть подвергнут наказанию испанским сувереном, а следовательно, должен быть выслан из Англии. В результате провинившийся посол получил от английских властей приказ покинуть пределы Королевства.

В вестфальский период (1648—1815 гг.) развития международного права окончательное закрепление в форме международного обычая получили правила об иммунитете послов, сопровождающих их членов семей и персонала от гражданской и уголовной юрисдикции государств пребывания, равно как и правила о неприкосновенности посольских помещений. В рассматриваемый период повышенное внимание тематике дипломатического иммунитета уделяется в научных международно-правовых разработках (Г. Гроций, 1625 г., К. Бинкершок, 1721 г., Э. Ваттель, 1758 г.).

Версальский (1919—1945 гг.) период международного права ознаменовался попытками кодификации сложившихся к тому времени норм о дипломатическом иммунитете. Впервые такая кодификация была предпринята на региональном уровне — Гаванская конвенция о дипломатических служащих от 1928 г., участниками которой были государства Панамериканского союза. Вместе с тем эта Конвенция всё же не вполне адекватно отражала существующую на тот момент практику в области дипломатического права. Более продуманным в этом отношении является Гарвардский проект конвенции о дипломатических привилегиях и иммунитетах 1932 года.

Первая универсальная кодификация обычных норм дипломатического права была предпринята уже в период современного международного права вспомогательным органом Генеральной Ассамблеи ООН — Комиссией международного права, результатом работы которой стала Венская конвенция о дипломатических сношениях от 18 апреля 1961 года. В ней зафиксированы не только сложившиеся к тому времени в дипломатической практике государств единообразные правила, но и новые правила, насчет которых у государств прежде не было единого понимания (речь, прежде всего, идет о привилегиях и иммунитетах младшего персонала посольств, исключений из иммунитета, а также статуса дипломатов, являющихся гражданами государства пребывания). Именно Венская конвенция стала тем универсальным инструментом, регулирующим отношения в области дипломатического права, в том числе и вопросы дипломатического иммунитета.

Название: “Qualifications of an Ambassador”

Источник: <http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/essays/delaboulaye.htm>

Francis de Laboulaye, French Ambassador to Brazil, Japan, and the United States

The first reaction of most professional diplomats, when they are asked about the criteria to be used in choosing ambassadors, is to describe their own qualifications. This is a very natural reaction, but if anything useful is to come from such an inquiry it is necessary to step back and look at the essential elements of the position of chief of mission, i.e., of ambassador. One simple definition of diplomacy is that it is the oral aspect of international relations. There is an essential difference between what is written and what is spoken, not only because spoken words are essentially more ephemeral (*verba volant*), but because the spoken language has infinitely more nuances, being both richer and more subtle than written texts.

Consequently, in an oral exchange one can suggest more than one could in writing, and if one knows how to listen can also understand the other side better. It is in the oral domain that not only "interests" can be adjusted or comprehended, but also viewpoints, plans and intentions. But oral diplomatic communication can only be effective if the conversations are part of an ongoing process, if the talks stretch over a period of time and can be resumed each time when it is necessary. And such conversations will only be effective if the interlocutors, while of a level of responsibility, are not those who hold supreme responsibility. If the top people meet face to face, men or women whose every word risks being the last word, the word without further recourse, most of the time they will not say anything useful because the tension is simply too great. On the other hand, someone who is situated a little lower on the ladder of

responsibility can orally explore things much further without compromising anyone but himself, and in this manner he may encounter opportunities which he may either seize or let slip by.

No telephones, certainly not a red or green one, can change the situation. They have their utility in certain cases but they do not do away with the necessity for permanent conversation which, in the strictest sense of that term, is diplomacy. This is how we look at the essential requirements of the position. Let us now look at how and from where it may best be filled.

It seems to us that even with the most rigorous selection a corps of the highest ranking diplomats will not consist only of superb performers. Let us be honest - nobody has to the same degree all the qualities necessary to be a perfect ambassador. The distribution among them is likely to be the same as elsewhere: ten percent who are very good and the rest less good, some of them still less so. It would be a great mistake to seek only one type of personality. Yet there are certain qualifications which strike us as essential.

One qualification is what a French colleague, who is now a well-reputed author, called "the specialty of the general." The ambassador must always have his eye on the most general aspects of what he does, namely on the overriding interests. These of course today cover fields which are more and more specialized: not only strategy and tactics, economics, technology, but also social relations, pure science and, finally philosophy, culture, and religion.

What, then, is to be done? One has to supply the ambassador with attaches or special advisors. What then will be his relationship with them? Either he has confidence in them and delegates his authority, in which case he may rapidly lose control of the operations, or else he will not rely on them but will not be able to tell what is to be done. It is, therefore, highly desirable that he should have his own judgment which comes from experience. What kind of experience? Experience that comes from success in previous operations. In other words, it is

not a bad idea that the ambassador should have had in his private life occasion to come to grips with the "real world" and that he should know, in any case, the colossal inertia of social structures and of individuals. In this manner he should be able to judge the quality of his advisors and experts and draw profit from their advice. It is true that he must also have a certain amount of technical knowledge in order to properly appreciate the quality of that advice. We believe that frankness requires us to state that there is no neat solution to this dilemma. There is no perfect way out. And there is no perfect ambassador. If there were such a person he would be highly inconvenient and bothersome.

In addition to the enlargement of the domains of science and culture which makes it difficult to discharge the functions of an ambassador during these closing years of the century, there are other problems which have to do with the transformation of the very tissue of international relations.

There was a time when it was enough to defend the "national interest," which was defined as everything that contributes to the prosperity, autonomy and prestige of the society and the state which is represented by an ambassador. There was no problem; it was understood that the purpose was to maintain the equilibrium between the five or six leading powers and at the same time to obtain commercial advantages, obtain respect for the rights of one's nationals, for one's flag, etc. Everyone's horizon was limited to his own nation. "Wer von Europa spricht," said Bismarck, "hat unrecht" - whoever speaks of Europe goes beyond what is his business. Put in simple words, whoever used themes that spoke of Europe was doing so only for selfish national reasons. That was perhaps true in 1878; it certainly is not true in 1983.

Today the horizon of diplomacy has widened under the influence of the threat of universal destruction, the growing interconnection of economic interests, the vast movements of populations, the diffusion of technical knowledge, the influence of the media, etc. Today, therefore, one has to take

account both of national and of collective interests, which means that an ambassador must be alert to the effects that the policies of his government may have on others. Unless he is able to encompass both the national and the collective dimension, he is not doing his job properly. In a sense he cannot intelligently defend his nation's interests, for these encounter the interests of others everywhere. There are of course ambassadors who maintain a narrow perspective, but they are not really effective and thus do not belong to the minority of good ones.

His position, being situated at a high level of responsibility without himself having the power to make political decisions, allows the ambassador to weigh the national interest against the universal interest and to throw his weight into the scales of the latter if that is necessary. Of course, this entails the risk of making himself odious to his own government or to the host government or to an international organization to which he may be accredited - or to all three at the same time.

Here, again, one must not expect a perfect solution; there can never be a stable equilibrium. What is essential is that the two concerns, the national and the collective one, be clearly understood and recognized at all times. In this the character - the strength of character - of the chief of mission plays an important role. He must not be narrowly centered on his own country. He must always seek to understand the reasons that dictated policies of his own government as well as those of the government of the host country.

It happens occasionally that an ambassador is accused of representing the interests of his own country less effectively than he represents those of the country to which he is accredited. Of course an ambassador does not like to hear this. And yet, without indulging excessively in paradox, it might be said that the accusation constitutes, at least in part, also a tribute to the intellectual and moral qualities of the diplomat in question.

It should go without saying that there are strict limits, dictated by common sense and the realities of the situation, to how far an ambassador can go in opposing a position of his own government. If a compromise is not possible and once the final decision has been made, he must of course loyally and scrupulously implement it even if it goes against what he had recommended. But until the final decision is made an ambassador owes his government the frankest and most unvarnished advice. In some cases, if he finds it incompatible with his conscience to implement what he believes to be a wrong decision he can of course resign - but such cases should be rare.

There remains the question where one should look for good ambassadors, whether they should be professionals or persons drawn into diplomacy from outside. It is difficult to be categorical: some professionals have turned in amateurish performances, and there are cases where amateurs rather quickly became good professionals. Yet one should not underrate the existence of a "diplomatic technique" which may seem esoteric to outsiders but really bases itself on long experience. There are real problems if one seeks to enrich the diplomatic establishment with talented outsiders from the world of business or finance or education; but those problems would be greatly diminished if the movement went in both directions - if there were a system of rotation whereby career diplomats go out periodically into that world to do practical work at a high level of responsibility and thus to enrich their own experience and the diplomatic service - with a better knowledge of the problems of the nongovernmental world. In this manner there would be a greater likelihood of coming up with the desired type: not "specialist of the general" but specialist and generalist at the same time, which is not so simple.

Exercise 1: Use context clues to get the meaning of the words/phrases and give their Russian equivalents.

professional diplomats, an inquiry, an essential difference, an ongoing process, the top people meet face to face, to encounter, which strike us as essential, delegates his authority, to properly appreciate the quality of, the transformation of the very tissue of international relations, the horizon of diplomacy has widened, to take account, to encompass both the national and the collective dimension, a perfect solution, a tribute to the intellectual and moral qualities of the diplomat, persons drawn into diplomacy from outside

Exercise 2: Read the statements below and determine whether they are true or false. If the statement is false, correct it.

1. One simple definition of diplomacy is that it is the oral aspect of international relations.
2. Consequently, in the written exchange one can suggest more than one could in speech, and if one knows how to listen can also understand the other side better. It is in the oral domain that not only "interests" can be adjusted or comprehended, but also viewpoints, plans and intentions. But written diplomatic communication can only be effective if the conversations are part of an ongoing process, if the talks stretch over a period of time and can be resumed each time when it is necessary.

3. No telephones, certainly not a red or green one, can change the situation. They have their utility in certain cases but they do not do away with the necessity for permanent conversation which, in the strictest sense of that term, is diplomacy.
4. One has to supply the ambassador with attorneys or special advocates. What then will be his relationship with them? Either he has confidence in them and delegates his authority, in which case he may rapidly get control of the operations, or else he will not rely on them but will not be able to write down what is to be done.
5. There was a time when it was enough to defend the "national interest," which was defined as everything that contributes to the prosperity, autonomy and prestige of the ambassador and the president who is represented by an ambassador.
6. Today, therefore, one has to take account both of national and of collective interests, which means that an ambassador must be alert to the effects that the policies of his government may have on others.
7. There are of course ambassadors who maintain a narrow perspective, but they are not really effective and thus do not belong to the minority of good ones.
8. Of course, this entails the risk of making himself odious to his own government or to the host government or to an international organization to which he may be accredited - or to all three at the same time.
9. He must always seek to understand the reasons that dictated policies of his own government as well as those of the government of the native country.

10. It is difficult to be categorical: some professionals have turned in amateurish performances, and there are cases where amateurs rather quickly became good professionals.

Exercise 3: Translate the text into English.

Посол России в Греции Владимир Чхиквишвили: Профессия дипломата вообще достаточно уникальна. Одна из причин этой уникальности в том, что она как бы вобрала в себя ряд других профессий. Дипломат, несомненно, должен быть и историком, и политологом, и даже экономистом. Одно из важных качеств дипломата — четко, ясно излагать свои мысли на бумаге, что сродни журналистской работе.

Немыслим дипломат без хорошего знания иностранных языков, и не одного. Многие наши выдающиеся дипломаты начинали именно как переводчики. Думаю, что важны такие качества как профессионализм, аналитическое мышление, умение обобщать и прогнозировать, коммуникабельность, тактичность, доброжелательность. Главное же — вера в свою страну и отстаивание в любых условиях ее интересов.

Посол РФ в Польше Александр Алексеев: Сотрудников российской дипломатической службы отличает, в первую очередь, высокий профессионализм. Это означает не только хорошее знание языка страны пребывания, особенностей местной политической кухни. Человек должен обладать общей эрудицией, выдержкой, умением терпеливо выслушать собеседника, даже если его взгляды отличаются от его собственных, а тон высказываний агрессивен. Принципиально важно избегать всего, что может быть истолковано как менторство, намерение поучать партнеров, вмешиваться в их внутренние дела.

Россия — великая страна. За действиями ее представителей внимательно наблюдают многие. Очень приятно, что за редчайшим исключением наши дипломаты оказываются на высоте.

Посол РФ в Колумбии Павел Сергиев: В преддверии наступающего праздника хотелось бы напомнить, что российская внешнеполитическая служба имеет богатую и славную историю. Глубокая теоретическая подготовка, знание обычаев и традиций страны пребывания, а также умелое использование передающегося из поколения в поколение, накопленного веками опыта работы — вот главные составляющие "секрета успеха" российской дипломатии.

Посол России в Ливане Александр Засыпкин: Если оставить в стороне концептуальные вещи и говорить об индивидуальном "оружии", то я бы выделил креативность с учетом того, что наша внешняя политика нацелена на взаимодействие с партнерами, поиск развязок спорных проблем и конфликтных ситуаций. То есть надо уметь создавать ткань политического процесса, предлагать варианты продвижения к урегулированию. Еще в наш арсенал традиционно входят добротное знание местной специфики и искренность в общении с партнерами. В Ливане важно знать арабский язык, поскольку это приводит на телеканалы в прямой эфир. Следует добавить, что отстаивать позиции хорошо тогда, когда уверен в их справедливости. Поэтому для нас важно опираться на международную законность, единые стандарты и нравственные ценности.

Название: “**Common Denominators of Good Ambassadors**”

Источник: <http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/essays/gruber.htm>

Karl Gruber, Austrian Foreign Minister and Austrian Ambassador to the United States, Spain, Switzerland, and West Germany

Having been both foreign minister and ambassador, I have seen the problem of ambassadorial appointments from the side of both those who make the appointments and those who receive them. I have been in a position to judge when and how ambassadors fall flat on their face, and why some distinguish themselves. I believe there is one common denominator for the performance of superior ambassadors, and that is skill in communication. It is communication of a very special kind, which must be learned, but without the basic aptitude for communication an ambassador cannot be successful in his manifold tasks. Contrary to the traditional image of an ambassador as a highly polished individual who is so circumspect in what he says that it requires a special talent (allegedly found only in other diplomats) to figure out what he is communicating, I have found that plain speaking is an essential ingredient for a diplomat's success. He must of course be tactful and sometimes artful in the way he communicates, but the message must come through clearly and precisely. Articulateness in explaining, reporting, defending, and discussing information on his country's position and other matters is, to my mind, essential.

The finest among American ambassadors with whom I have had dealings were Robert Murphy, Charles E. Bohlen, G. Frederick Reinhardt, and Llewellyn E. Thompson. They all had a thorough knowledge of international affairs, they were cosmopolitan and had empathy for the concerns of other countries, and they were not too cautious in the way they explained what was going on and what their country was trying to accomplish. The worst among American diplomats whom I have met - and I would rather not give their names - were

those who were exceedingly cautious (not merely circumspect) and who wanted to elicit information without giving anything in return.

For communication among diplomats is a two-way street: one cannot expect to obtain much information unless one is able and willing to convey information. The ambassador with whom everyone wants to talk is the one who is interesting to talk with. This was especially true, I think, of the men whom the United States sent out to foreign countries in the earliest days of the republic, when they were statesmen who had been among the decision makers in their own capital and "men of the world" who moved easily among the decision makers of other countries.

It will be seen from the above that I am not necessarily critical of the custom of the United States to choose some people for ambassadorial positions who are not professional diplomats - but I believe such persons must have unusual stature in order to be successful, they must be well-read, well-spoken, they must have a thorough knowledge of international affairs, and they must be persons of cosmopolitan tastes and attitudes. Provincialism, ethnocentricity, inability to understand nuances in foreign countries, and the belief that one's own country is the best in everything-these are handicaps which, after a certain age, no amount of training or experience can overcome.

In my own country, which has a relatively small foreign service with only a limited intake of new officers every year, almost every diplomat can expect to become an ambassador. This has its advantages and disadvantages. Among the advantages is that our diplomats need not be afraid that their career will be in ruins if they make a mistake, and that they can consequently be innovative. Among the disadvantages is that there is too little selection of the best people and a consequent tendency on the part of some of our ambassadors to become bureaucratic. Yet excessive competitiveness can also be a liability, as I have seen in the case of diplomats who came from an environment where they had to

claw their way to the top: they became competitive also with their peers, both within their service and with their diplomatic colleagues of other countries. Diplomacy requires effective habits of cooperation.

The best ambassadors I have known have been people who, in addition to a thorough knowledge of their own country and the country of their assignment, also have a well-rounded view of the world (Weltbild) into which what was happening could be fitted. Without such a world picture it is virtually impossible to reach a firm conclusion about the significance of developments. Nowadays politics permeates every field of state activity. Any small war anywhere has the potential of leading to a world conflagration. The growing closeness and interdependence of nations and the interaction of their public opinions have had the result that the acid of ideological indoctrination seeps into every cleft of international and internal differences. No wonder that any cool assessment of the moving forces of our times requires increased knowledge, sound judgment, and the ability to attach the proper importance to what is happening in a large variety of fields. A good ambassador must understand the significance also of things that happen outside the area where he is accredited.

Communication, as I have used the term above, includes not only collecting and conveying information to and from one's government; it also means negotiating both in the sense of developing concrete agreements and in the sense of adjusting differences and lining up support outside of concrete agreements. While skillful reporting makes the reputation of the ambassador, negotiating is the real essence of his activity. Negotiating is not just sitting at a table where two or more countries more or less oppose one another. It begins a long time before a date is set for sitting down at the table. The process of softening up the other side is almost as important as the exchange of more or less brilliant arguments at the negotiating table.

The ambassador must convince the other government of the importance of the subject under negotiation, and of a compromise useful to his own country. But he must also convince his own government of the limits within which a compromise can be found (or even whether a compromise is necessary). People at home are often inclined to consider the limits recommended by an ambassador as due to excessive caution on his part, alienation from his own country, or plain muddle-headedness. The worst thing would be to recommend or predict an outcome of the negotiations which turns out to be too pessimistic, for instance if the foreign ministry then sends out someone "stronger" who finds that he could "easily" obtain more than the ambassador had thought possible. To find the right course between these conflicting assessments needs skill, experience, courage, and a cool head. The least desirable outcome from the effort to steer between the Scylla of failure and the Charybdis of over-cautiousness would be to send meaningless communications to the home office "in order to protect oneself." One may protect himself or herself for the immediate moment but may damage his further career in the process.

A good diplomat must be precise. Experience teaches us that the higher the summit the flimsier the agreements. Top-level politicians are much too impatient to watch details, important as they may be, and are always in a hurry to shake hands to mark a "rapprochement" or other agreement. As an American diplomat once said to me: On an icy summit there grows only what you have carried up there. So it is wise to send conscientious, publicity-shy individuals ahead to prepare the texts and give the top officials concise information about the points to be especially watched. For instance, the word "support" can mean anything from a timely smile to substantial military support. Specificity is therefore most important. Naturally there are exceptions when agreement for the sake of agreement, even at the cost of vagueness, is desirable or necessary - but such cases are very rare.

A good diplomat also needs a sense of humor. He should always have some remarks ready to ease tension once negotiations get near a breaking point. One example that comes to mind involves a negotiation in which everything went wrong. (It happened to involve agrarian exchanges in Central Europe, a subject that is always tough and intractable). One of the negotiators had a long beard, and his stolid demeanor did not augur well for a successful outcome. His counterpart finally said: Before we part, I have one more question. When you go to sleep at night, do you tuck your beard under the covers or do you leave it above them? There was laughter all around, and for the first time the patriarch allowed a smile to crease his lips. Eventually an agreement was concluded, actually a lot sooner than had been expected. I do not mean to imply that the jocular question was the reason for the successful outcome of the negotiation, but I believe the incident illustrates the importance of the ability to loosen up the atmosphere, of knowing when some levity will help smooth the way to easier discourse and thus to agreement.

A word about discretion. An ambassadorial position should never be given to anyone who is hungry for publicity. In my opinion it is best, even in official reports, to use personal quotations only when absolutely necessary, unless the information conveyed is meaningful only when attributed to a certain high-ranking functionary who conveyed it with attribution in his mind. If ever a "friend" or mere acquaintance reads his name in a report of another government, even if everything in that report is favorable to him, he is much less likely to be candid and open at the next encounter. Any experienced diplomat knows that written reports nowadays can find their way to offices for which they were never intended. To give contacts confidence that their remarks will be held in confidence, I usually preferred to talk with them in informal surroundings rather than in their offices. I also found it prudent even to protect my handwritten notes.

Finally, like anyone who wishes to be successful in a competitive environment, an ambassador must have good judgment. This goes almost without saying, but good judgment today doesn't mean what good judgment meant at the time of sailing ships and horse-drawn carriages. When important things are happening, the ambassador's interpretation of them must be prompt if it is going to do any good because the press will be doing its own interpreting and so will other governments. Therefore reporting and analysis must sometimes be not only timely but almost instantaneous. Good judgment today must come faster than it did a generation ago. And if an ambassador has in his mind a concept of the interrelationship between events around the world, he is more likely to be listened to and his judgments will carry greater weight. This applies both to his written communications to his capital and his oral exchanges with officials of the country to which he is accredited.

Exercise 1: Use context clues to get the meaning of the words/phrases and give their Russian equivalents.

ambassadorial appointments, a position to judge, the basic aptitude for communication, an essential ingredient for a diplomat's success, articulateness, consequently, had to claw their way to the top, effective habits of cooperation, cool assessment, at the negotiating table, a compromise, desirable outcome, substantial military support, vagueness, to ease tension, to imply that, is hungry for publicity, acquaintance, favorable, informal surroundings, a competitive environment, judgment

Exercise 2: Read the statements below and determine whether they are true or false. If the statement is false, correct it.

1. It is communication of a very special kind, which must be learned, but without the basic aptitude for communication an ambassador cannot be successful in his manifold tasks.
2. Articulateness in explaining, reporting, defending, and discussing information on his country's position and other matters is, to my mind, essential.
3. The best among American diplomats whom I have met - and I would rather give their names - were those who were exceedingly cautious (not merely circumspect) and who wanted to elicit information without giving anything in return.
4. The ambassador with whom everyone wants to talk is the one who is interesting to talk about.
5. Yet excessive competitiveness can also be a liability, as I have seen in the case of diplomats who came from an environment where they had to claw their way to the top: they became competitive also with their staff and boss, both within their service and with their diplomatic colleagues of services. Diplomacy requires effective habits of cooperation.
6. The best ambassadors I have known have been people who, in addition to a thorough knowledge of their own country and the country of their assignment, also have a well-rounded view of the world (Weltbild) into which what was happening could be fitted.

7. A good diplomat must be precise. Experience teaches us that the higher the summit the flimsier the agreements. Top-level politicians are much too impatient to watch details, important as they may be, and are always in a hurry to shake hands to mark a "rapprochement" or other agreement.
8. A good diplomat also needs a sense of humor. He should always have some remarks ready to escalate tension once negotiations get near a breaking point.
9. An ambassadorial position should never be given to anyone who is hungry for neglect.
10. Finally, like anyone who wishes to be successful in the multicultural environment, an ambassador must have good judgment. This goes almost without saying, but good judgment today means the same what good judgment meant at the time of sailing ships and horse-drawn carriages.

Exercise 3: Translate the text into English.

«Задача дипломатии — поддерживать связь между двумя суверенными государствами при помощи переговоров», — пишет известный автор трудов по дипломатии англичанин Гарольд Николсон, британский дипломат и историк. В 1939 году он опубликовал книгу «Дипломатия», ныне считающуюся классической работой такого рода. Николсон отметил, что несмотря на то, что дипломаты общаются, используя некий общепринятый международный код (специальные фразы, выражения и слова), тем не менее даже они не застрахованы от того, что иностранные коллеги поймут их неверно. Роль коммуникативной деятельности человека в современном мире трудно

переоценить, особенно говоря о дипломатии. Речь занимает особое положение в иерархии психических процессов, благодаря чему выступает как основное средство общения, орудие мышления и является частью человеческой культуры.

Общение - это многоплановый процесс развития контактов между людьми, порождаемый потребностями совместной деятельности. Общение включает в себя обмен информацией между ее участниками, который может быть охарактеризован в качестве коммуникативной стороны общения. Искусство общения - важнейший навык. Чтобы стать мастером общения, необходимо развивать самые разнообразные навыки: это и ораторское мастерство, и умение управлять конфликтом, и навыки ведения переговоров, и подстройка к собеседнику, владение мимикой, голосом и жестикуляцией. В жизни дипломата искусство общения занимает особое место. Дипломат должен уметь общаться с разными слоями населения правильно и грамотно. Умение владеть языком – один из главных инструментов дипломата. Для дипломата, участвующего в переговорах, работа начинается задолго до того, как он встречает своего оппонента.

Прежде всего необходимо изучить проблему, которую предстоит обсуждать. Общее правило здесь простое - чем больше вы знаете, тем лучше. Еще в древние времена считалось, что хороший дипломат должен быть разносторонне образованным человеком. Аристотель в своей "Риторике" дает длинный перечень наук, которыми будущий дипломат должен овладеть, прежде чем он дерзнет показать себя на поприще внешней политики. Древнегреческие дипломаты должны были разбираться не только в текущих политических проблемах, но заодно владеть географией, историей, экономикой, военным делом и быть хорошими ораторами. Впрочем, из этого правила бывают и исключения. Когда дипломат долго участвует в сложном переговорном процессе, он,

случается, слишком углубляется в детали и теряет из виду перспективу. Переговоры, - это, в сущности, основа дипломатии и умение вести переговоры - "высший пилотаж" в дипломатической профессии. Дело это далеко не простое. У дипломатических переговоров есть ряд особенностей, благодаря которым они существенно отличаются от, скажем, переговоров в бизнесе и даже от внутривластных переговоров.

Прежде всего, дипломат, строя свою переговорную позицию, исходит из понятия "национального интереса". Это значит, что его позиция должна быть надпартийной и не зависеть от идеологических и прочих интересов.

В ходе переговоров обычно используются все средства давления на противника. Участники начинают с изложения своих исходных позиций, часто включающих завышенные требования, и нередко делают это в ультимативной форме. Во время переговоров между соперниками, для того, чтобы вызвать замешательство противника, стороны нередко выставляют дополнительные требования в моменты, когда все основные параметры будущего соглашения, казалось бы, уже согласованы. Очень часто используется увязка объективно не связанных или слабо связанных между собой вопросов. Переговоры между соперниками обычно сопровождаются пропагандистской кампанией в средствах массовой информации, рассчитанной на то, чтобы оказать еще большее давление на противника. Участие в переговорах такого типа связано с большими психологическими нагрузками. Важно воздерживаться от эмоциональных реакций, на что противник часто и рассчитывает. Важно также не отвергать его предложения с порога, но стараться найти в них позитивные элементы и перефразировать так, чтобы получилась приемлемая формулировка. Даже в самой накаленной атмосфере желательно чаще говорить "да" с оговорками, чем однозначное "нет".

Название: **“The Makings of a Good Ambassador”**

Источник: <http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/essays/kitahara.htm>

Hideo Kitahara, Japanese Ambassador to Vietnam and France, and Representative to the United Nations agencies in Geneva

When I started my career as a diplomat before the second world war, it was under an ambassador who, to this day, seems to me to typify the accomplished classical diplomat. In addition to Japanese, he knew Greek and Latin and spoke English, French and German. He used to say that in order to perform a diplomat's duties satisfactorily, one always had to be in a position to answer three questions: Who? When? What? The meaning of these three questions is that a diplomat facing any given political move must, under all circumstances, be able to tell his government who made a decision, on what date, and what it was about. This ambassador's threefold question is, I believe, a fair summary of an ambassador's task in the classical era, and of the qualities required to fulfill them. First and foremost, he had to inform his government about the political life in his country of residence so as to ensure proper handling of relations and negotiations between states. Within the framework of their governments' instructions, ambassadors enjoyed extensive representational and negotiating authority. As a rule, inter-state relations were governed by treaties and agreements. International life was conducted on the basis of respect for one's signature: *pacta sunt servanda*. Today international life and diplomatic relations are completely different. There are many more independent states, and the number of diplomatic missions has grown exponentially. Understandably enough, an ambassador will not do exactly the same work when posted to a superpower as when he is in a country with virtually no land, population or resources. In the days of the League of Nations, the international order was in

the hands of a small number of independent states to which were appended the colonial complexes. But in the meantime other forms of interdependence have emerged and have given rise to international legal entities to which diplomats are accredited, as is the case in the European Community, the O.E.C.D., and the United Nations with its many specialized agencies.

An entirely new complex of issues has arisen, involving such issues as the environment, population, science and technology, economic and social development, narcotics, the law of the sea, or nuclear energy - issues of great importance which did not even exist a generation ago and with which a diplomat today must be conversant. Ambassadors accredited to international bodies no longer engage in state-to-state relations but deal with collectivities specializing in economics, international trade, culture, etc. So their competence should be both extensive and highly technical, as they are expected to handle issues involving such matters as non-tariff barriers or EC agricultural regulations.

I think it is obvious that this requires an entirely different type of diplomat than those who engaged only in the traditional forms of international relations. The rise of multilateral diplomacy has been accompanied by a rise in rapid and easy international communications. The number of international meetings of heads of states and governments and of ministers has multiplied since the second world war. This trend, sometimes called direct diplomacy, has also substantially changed the role of ambassadors - changed it but not lessened its utility and importance. Politicians and direct government envoys, and non-professional ambassadors appointed on the basis of political criteria, tend to focus on the short term, if not on spectacular action. Professional ambassadors, acting as advisers to them, are responsible for reminding them of the importance of continuity and stability in international relations and for shifting the emphasis to a longer-term view.

Yet another noteworthy feature of modern diplomacy is its organizational complexity. Major embassies house political, military, economic, scientific, agricultural, cultural and other departments. Thus an ambassador's role is also akin to that of a company manager, in charge of sometimes over a hundred staff members. Consequently, an ambassador must be a good administrator.

The qualifications of a modern ambassador are implicit in this brief description of his duties. First, he must have in-depth knowledge and understanding of major world problems. Superhuman capabilities would be necessary for one to be familiar with all the details of these global issues. So ambassadors should try to form a clear picture of the international situation, to analyze it properly and to evolve their own judgment. They can no longer be content with understanding bilateral relations alone, in view of the interdependence of nations. There are far more factors in this judgmental process than there were in the days of classical diplomacy; consequently, the ability to synthesize should be developed even more than the ability to analyze.

As communications were facilitated - thus giving rise to "direct" diplomacy - ambassadors lost a large part of their role as governmental go-betweens. The days when ambassadors awaited instructions and solemnly conveyed messages are over. Modern ambassadors take it upon themselves to inform their governments about the situation in their country of residence, about trends in public opinion, about possible reactions to measures considered by their governments. Often, because of the very speedup of communications that is supposed to lessen their effectiveness, they can suggest to their foreign ministries how they should be instructed. And because the ambassador is on the spot and knows both the issues and what can reasonably be achieved, he (or she) can have more influence than an ambassador had in the days of slower communication.

Thanks to the information that embassies collect and synthesize, ambassadors, thus prepare the ground for and sometimes influence the initiatives of their governments, and are then in the best position to explain these moves in terms that the host country will best understand. This new role of ambassadors requires them to make many new kinds of contacts, not only in official circles but also in all social groups and more particularly in the media. In this way, ambassadors continue to "convey messages," but they convey them to millions of people.

As regards the human qualities an ambassador should have, it seems to me that the principal one is broadmindedness. Ambassadors should be open to cultural diversity and be able to understand it. They must certainly strive to promote their country's national interests, but should not follow narrowly nationalistic impulses to which people are subject who have not made international relations their career. A good ambassador must be a patriot - that goes without saying; but he must always bear in mind that every country is part of an international system and that the future of the world depends on at least a tolerably good functioning of that system.

Exercise 1: Use context clues to get the meaning of the words/phrases and give their Russian equivalents.

perform a diplomat's duties, threefold question, to ensure proper handling of relations and negotiations, a superpower, in the meantime, conversant, extensive, utility, to tend to focus on, on the basis of political criteria, another noteworthy feature, implicit, capabilities, ability to synthesize, governmental go-betweens, to lessen their effectiveness, broadmindedness, cultural diversity, to promote their country's national interests

Exercise 2: Read the statements below and determine whether they are true or false. If the statement is false, correct it.

1. He used to say that in order to perform a diplomat's duties satisfactorily, one always had to be in a position to answer three questions: Who? When? What?
2. The meaning of these three questions is that a diplomat facing any given political move must, under no circumstances, be able to tell his government why a decision was made, on what date, and what it was about.
3. As a rule, inter-state relations were governed by treaties and agreements.

4. In the days of the League of Nations, the international order was in the hands of a great number of independent states to which were appended the colonial complexes.
5. An entirely new complex of issues has arisen, involving such issues as the environment, population, science and technology, economic and social development, narcotics, the law of the sea, or nuclear energy - issues of great importance which existed even a generation ago and with which a diplomat today must be conversant.
6. Professional ambassadors, acting as teachers to them, are responsible for reminding them of the importance of continuity and stability in domestic issues and for shifting the emphasis to a longer-term view.
7. Thus an ambassador's role is also akin to that of a company manager, in charge of sometimes over a hundred staff members. Consequently, an ambassador must be a good administrator.
8. As communications were facilitated - thus giving rise to "direct" diplomacy - ambassadors lost a large part of their role as governmental go-betweens.
9. Modern ambassadors take it upon themselves to inform their governments about the situation in other countries, about trends in fashion, about possible reactions to measures considered by their governments.
10. Ambassadors should be open to cultural diversity and be able to understand it. They must certainly strive to promote their country's national interests, but should not follow narrowly nationalistic impulses to which people are subject who have not made international relations their career.

Exercise 3: Translate the text into English.

Рабочие будни дипломата — не только светские приемы и беседы о судьбах мира с властью предрешающими: придется заниматься огромным количеством рутинной работы, связанной с оформлением документов, переводами, организацией мероприятий, выполнением разнообразных поручений начальства и т. д. График ненормированный — дипломаты частенько засиживаются допоздна, работают в воскресенье и на праздниках, а в разгар романтического свидания всегда есть вероятность внезапно получить звонок от начальства. Кроме того, при работе за рубежом руководство всегда может захотеть узнать, где вы проводите свое свободное время.

Согласно Венской конвенции, дипломат за границей может не только защищать интересы своей страны, но и «с помощью всех легитимных средств выяснять обстоятельства и события в принимающей стране, и сообщать о них руководству направившей его страны». Сотрудники посольств, естественно, не распространяются об этом аспекте своей работы, но можно предположить, что в нее входит поиск полезных осведомителей среди журналистов, предпринимателей, политиков и дипломатов других стран. Важно и умение тщательно анализировать открытые источники.

Человеку, мечтающему свободно путешествовать по миру, лучше задуматься о другой профессии — в этом плане на дипломатов накладываются определенные ограничения. В частности, им запрещено выезжать за пределы Российской Федерации по частным делам без уведомления работодателя. Кроме того, нельзя стать дипломатом, если у вас есть второе гражданство или вы состоите в браке с человеком, имеющим второе или просто другое гражданство. Если же у сотрудника

МИДа появляется потребность заключить такой союз, ему приходится выбирать между профессией и семьей.

Дипломатов учат очень четко и взвешенно формулировать свои мысли и отвечать за каждое слово, чувствовать психологические уязвимости собеседника, отстаивать свои интересы, оставаясь любезным человеком и приятным собеседником. Но не стоит делать ставку только на свой дар убеждения и харизму: очень большое внимание в этой профессии уделяется командной работе, а от способности молодого дипломата неукоснительно выполнять указания руководства будет зависеть его карьера, так что тут опасно перебарщивать с инициативой. Личная точка зрения на те или иные политические проблемы не должна влиять на выполнение поставленной задачи, хотя способ реализации можно обсуждать и в какой-то степени корректировать. Так или иначе, перед дипломатом наверняка периодически будут вставать непростые этические дилеммы, и к этому стоит быть готовым.

Также для успеха в этой области нужны выдающиеся способности к иностранным языкам, обширные познания в области международной политики, истории экономики и права, умение тонко чувствовать особенности культуры и менталитета других стран и понимание того, как представить собственную страну в лучшем свете с поправкой на эти особенности восприятия. Важно развивать умение как концентрироваться на рутинной работе, как и быстро принимать решения в условиях неопределенности.

Название: “A Diplomatic Mission”

Источник: <http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/functions.htm>

Functions of a Diplomatic Mission: basic functions of a diplomatic mission include

- Represent the home country in the host country
- Protect the interests of the home country and its citizens in the host country
- Negotiate with the government of the host country
- Monitor and report on conditions and developments in the commercial, economic, cultural, and scientific life of the host country
- Promote friendly relations between the host country and the home country
- Develop commercial, economic, cultural, and scientific relations between the host country and the home country.
- Issue passports, travel documents, and visas.

A country may have several different types of diplomatic missions in another country.

Embassy

A diplomatic mission located in the capital city of another country which generally offer a full range of services, including consular services.

High Commission

An embassy of a Commonwealth country located in another Commonwealth country.

Permanent Mission

A diplomatic mission to a major international organization.

Consulate General

A diplomatic mission located in a major city, other than the capital city, which provides a full range of services, including consular services.

Consulate

A diplomatic mission that is similar to a consulate general, but which does not provide a full range of services.

Consulate Headed by Honorary Consul

A diplomatic mission headed by an Honorary Consul which provides only a limited range of services.

Exercise 1: Use context clues to get the meaning of the words/phrases and give their Russian equivalents.

a diplomatic mission, citizens, to monitor, to issue passports, a full range of services, consular services, commonwealth, a consulate general, headed by, limited

Exercise 2: Translate the text into English.

Важно иметь в виду, что далеко не каждый сотрудник посольства — дипломат. В любом посольстве обязательно присутствует большое количество вспомогательного, технического состава (рабочие высокой

квалификации, охрана, служащие хозяйственной части, водители, в крупных посольствах ещё и повара и т. д.). В любом посольстве также присутствует несколько человек, обслуживающих передачу зашифрованной информации. Соответственно, дипломатов, то есть сотрудников МИД, имеющих дипломатические паспорта и облечённых дипломатическим иммунитетом, в посольстве обычно бывает не больше трети от общей численности сотрудников (не считая, разумеется, членов семей). Наименее ответственные технические должности — уборщиков, рабочих невысокой квалификации — могут занимать как граждане страны пребывания, так и члены семей сотрудников, принятые на эту работу уже «на месте».

Дипломатические должности в посольстве, в соответствии с устоявшейся международной практикой, следующие (в порядке убывания старшинства), помимо посла и следующего за ним советника-посланника:

- старший советник.
- советник.
- первый секретарь.
- второй секретарь.
- третий секретарь.
- атташе.
- секретарь-референт — не имеет дипломатического паспорта, но обладает дип. иммунитетом. Это должность, с которой молодой сотрудник МИД часто начинает свою карьеру. В дип.службе большинства стран такой должности не существует. В советское время в дипломатической службе СССР существовали также ещё более младшие должности дежурного референта и референта-переводчика, но в настоящее время они фактически

отменены (для перевода привлекается обычно кто-то из младших дипломатов, в российских посольствах специальной должности переводчика нет).

В дипломатической службе некоторых государств (в основном небольших и/или слаборазвитых) должностей ниже второго секретаря часто нет вообще.

Сотрудники крупного посольства разделены, как правило, на несколько групп (иногда называемых секциями), занимающихся определённой проблематикой страны, в которой находится посольство. Как правило, существуют группы:

- внешней политики
- экономических вопросов
- внутренней политики
- двусторонних отношений, то есть отношений страны пребывания со своей страной
- двустороннего культурного сотрудничества
- консульский отдел, занимающийся обслуживанием граждан своей страны на территории страны пребывания, решением их проблем в рамках законодательства и оформлением документов (паспорта, нотариальные документы, справки и др.) и выдачей виз. Консульский отдел посольства следует отличать от консульства, которое является отдельным от посольства учреждением. Если посольство находится в столице, то консульство — в другом крупном городе, но не в том, в котором посольство. Так, например, в Канаде существует посольство России в Оттаве, в котором есть консульский отдел, но генеральные консульства России находятся

в Монреале и Торонто. Консульский отдел посольства может находиться в отдельном здании, часто далеко от основного здания посольства, но даже в этом случае он не называется консульством.

Во главе группы стоит сотрудник как правило в должности старшего советника, советника или первого секретаря (опять же, дипломатический ранг может отличаться от занимаемой должности, например, у советника может быть ранг первого секретаря первого или второго класса. При назначении руководителем группы играет роль только должность, а старшинство по рангу может приниматься в расчёт лишь иногда, только при наличии других сотрудников с такой же должностью). В группы обычно входят, помимо руководителя, 3-5 сотрудников в различных должностях, редко больше.

Если посольство небольшое, с малым числом персонала (это относится обычно к посольствам в маленьких странах, не имеющих большого политико-экономического значения), то групп может быть меньше, или не быть вовсе — в таком случае один и тот же сотрудник может заниматься самым широким кругом вопросов. Однако консульскими вопросами всё равно занимается, как правило, специально выделенный сотрудник, свободный от остальных поручений.

Аппарат военного атташе (военный атташат) также является частью посольства. Общее руководство военным атташатам осуществляет посол, но непосредственное — военный атташе. В данном случае атташе — обозначение высшего военного представителя. Эту должность следует отличать от дипломатического атташе — самой низкой дипломатической должности (однако главу группы культурного сотрудничества в должности, скажем, советника, могут называть атташе по культуре).