PROCESSO SELETIVO PARA O DOUTORADO EM FILOSOFIA DA UFABC

PROVA DE PROFICIÊNCIA EM LÍNGUA INGLESA

Traduzir o texto abaixo para a língua portuguesa e responder, em português, às duas questões de compreensão formuladas em inglês ao final do texto.

There is a theoretical tradition that seeks to justify strongman rule, an ideological school of demagoguery, one might call it, that is now more relevant than ever. Within that tradition, one thinker stands out: the conservative German constitutional lawyer and political theorist Carl Schmitt (1888-1985). For a time, he was the principal legal adviser to the Nazi regime. And today his name is approaching a commonplace. Academics, policymakers and journalists appeal to him in order to shed light on populist trends in the US and elsewhere... After decades as a political rogue, forced to launch his attacks on liberalism from the sidelines, Schmitt's name has returned to prominence.

He was the great systematiser of populist thought, which makes him useful for understanding how populist strategies might play out in politics, as well as in the legal/constitutional sphere. In *The Concept of the Political* (1932), he claimed that fundamental to 'the political' is the distinction between friend and enemy – who is in the political community, and who is out – and that what matters in politics is *only* whether some ideological proposal stands a chance to be successful, given the historical context.

In the Weimar period, during which a rickety republic governed interwar Germany from 1918 to 1933, Schmitt took it as a basic fact that democracy was the sole principle of legitimacy capable of garnering mass support. So, for this supreme anti-liberal, the challenge of the times was to reinterpret democracy into authoritarian terms. Any ideology based on an idea of the 'substantive homogeneity' of the nation would do – a secular substitute for the religious basis on which political legitimacy had been founded in the past. Schmitt yoked that idea to his claim that the sovereign is 'he who decides on the state of exception'. Sovereignty is revealed in a situation of crisis, when the identity of the political community is at stake. In the circumstances of post-First World War constitutionalism, Schmitt located the bearer of sovereignty in the figure at the apex of the executive branch of government (in Weimar, the president of the Reich) because only he could rise above the fray of partisan politics and represent the political community.

The identification with Nazism obscures Schmitt's argument, couched in constitutional terms, which concludes that the chief executive is the real 'guardian of the constitution' and so the ultimate legal authority.

- 1. How could the study of Carl Schmitt's thought be of use today?
- 2. Explain with your words what is the core of Schmitt's theory and how he outlines a strategy from it within the context of Weimar Republic.