

**EDITAL Nº 1, DE 5 DE JULHO DE 2019**  
**CONCURSO DE ADMISSÃO À CARREIRA DE DIPLOMATA**

**CARGO: TERCEIRO-SECRETÁRIO DA CARREIRA DE DIPLOMATA**

*Data e horário da prova: domingo, 13/10/2019, às 14 h.*

**INSTRUÇÕES**  
**SEGUNDA FASE – DIA 2 – TARDE**

- Você receberá do fiscal:
  - 1 (um) caderno de provas contendo 1 (um) tema de redação; 1 (um) texto em inglês – para tradução para a língua portuguesa; 1 (um) texto em português – para elaboração de versão em inglês; 1 (um) texto em língua inglesa – para elaboração de resumo em inglês; e
  - 6 (seis) folhas de texto definitivo.
- Verifique se a paginação do caderno de provas discursivas e a codificação das folhas de texto definitivo estão corretas.
- Você dispõe de 5 (cinco) horas para fazer as provas discursivas, devendo controlar o tempo, pois não haverá prorrogação desse prazo. Esse tempo inclui a transcrição para as folhas de texto definitivo.
- Somente 1 (uma) hora após o início da prova, você poderá entregar suas folhas de texto definitivo e o caderno de provas e retirar-se da sala.
- Somente será permitido levar o caderno de provas 4 (quatro) horas e 45 (quarenta e cinco) minutos após o início da prova.
- Deixe sobre a carteira apenas o documento de identidade e a caneta esferográfica de tinta preta, fabricada com material transparente.
- Não é permitida a utilização de nenhum aparelho eletrônico ou de comunicação.
- Não é permitida a consulta a livros, dicionários, apontamentos e (ou) apostilas.
- Você somente poderá sair e retornar à sala de aplicação de provas na companhia de um fiscal do IADES.
- Não será permitida a utilização de lápis em nenhuma etapa das provas.
- Verifique se os seus dados estão corretos nas folhas de texto definitivo das provas discursivas. Caso haja algum dado incorreto, comunique ao fiscal.

**Tipo “U”**

## INSTRUÇÕES PARA AS PROVAS DISCURSIVAS

### PROVA DE LÍNGUA INGLESA

Orientações para a elaboração dos textos das provas discursivas.

- A prova de língua inglesa é composta por 1 (um) tema de redação; 1 (um) texto em inglês – para tradução para a língua portuguesa; 1 (um) texto em português – para elaboração de versão em inglês; e 1 (um) texto em língua inglesa – para elaboração de resumo em inglês.
- A prova deverá ser manuscrita, em letra legível, com caneta esferográfica de tinta preta, fabricada com material transparente, e as respostas deverão ser transcritas para as folhas de texto definitivo.
- As **folhas de texto definitivo** das provas discursivas não poderão ser assinadas, rubricadas e nem conter, em outro local que não o apropriado, nenhuma palavra ou marca que identifique o candidato, sob pena de anulação da prova.
- As **folhas de texto definitivo** são os únicos documentos válidos para a avaliação das provas discursivas.
- O candidato receberá 6 (seis) folhas de texto definitivo das provas discursivas, sendo 2 (duas) para a redação, 1 (uma) para a tradução, 1 (uma) para a versão e 2 (duas) para o resumo. As folhas de texto definitivo indicarão se pertencem à redação, à tradução, à versão ou ao resumo. O candidato deverá observar atentamente a correspondência entre redação, tradução, versão e resumo e folha de texto definitivo, sob pena de ter o seu texto avaliado negativamente.
- O espaço para rascunho, contido no caderno de provas, é de preenchimento facultativo e não valerá para avaliação das provas discursivas.
- A resposta para a redação deverá ter extensão mínima de 45 (quarenta e cinco) linhas e máxima de 50 (cinquenta) linhas. O resumo deverá contemplar de 35% a 50% do texto em até 50 (cinquenta) linhas.
- Será apenas a redação que desobedecer à extensão mínima ou máxima de linhas, deduzindo-se, da pontuação atribuída à redação, **1,0 (um)** para cada linha que faltar para atingir o mínimo ou que exceder o máximo exigido.
- Inicie, impreterivelmente, o seu texto na linha identificada como número 1 na página inicial da folha de texto definitivo.

### COMPOSITION

Read the following texts carefully.

#### Text 1

How can he explain to him? The world is not run from where he thinks. Not from his border fortresses, not even from Whitehall. The world is run from Antwerp, from Florence, from places he has never imagined; from Lisbon, from where the ships with sails of silk drift west and are burned up in the sun. Not from castle walls, but from counting houses, not by the call of the bugle but by the click of the abacus, not by the grate and click of the mechanism of the gun but by the scrape of the pen on the page of the promissory note that pays for the gun and the gunsmith and the powder and shot.

Mantel, Hilary. (2010) *Wolf Hall*: a novel. Picador, p. 349.

#### Text 2

[Diplomats] need to understand JPMorgan Chase or Google's diplomatic machinery in the way that they understand China's. They should be competing with the best technology they can lay their hands on. They should be on a digital war footing.

I often ask people who they think will have the greatest influence on the twenty-first century – Google or Britain? Increasingly, most say Google. I want to show in this book how they can be proved wrong. Google has been a technological superpower for a decade. Britain has been one for at least 250 years.

Fletcher, Tom. (2017) William Collins, p. 17, with adaptations.

Discuss whether and to what extent technological and economic changes over the past few decades have transformed the intrinsic nature of diplomacy and (or) international politics. Draw connections between the ideas in the two texts.

**Text length: 45 to 50 lines**  
**[value: 50,00 points]**

**RASCUNHO**

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		

31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		

**Read the following text carefully.**

The train bore me away, through the monstrous scenery. This was March, but the weather had been horribly cold and everywhere there were mounds of blackened snow. As we moved slowly through the outskirts of the town we passed row after row of little grey slum houses running at right angles to the embankment. At the back of one of the houses a young woman was kneeling on the stones, poking a stick up the leaden waste-pipe which ran from the sink inside and which I suppose was blocked. I had time to see everything about her – her coarse apron, her clumsy boots, her arms reddened by the cold. She looked up as the train passed, and I was almost near enough to catch her eye. She had a round pale face, the usual exhausted face of the slum girl who is twenty-five and looks forty, thanks to miscarriages and drudgery; and it wore, for the second in which I saw it, the most desolate, hopeless expression I have ever seen. It struck me then that we are mistaken when we say that “It isn’t the same for them as it would be for us”, and that people bred in the slums can imagine nothing but the slums. For what I saw in her face was not the ignorant suffering of an animal. She knew well enough what was happening to her – understood as well as I did how dreadful a destiny it was to be kneeling there in the bitter cold, on the slimy stone of a slum backyard, poking a stick up a foul drain-pipe.

Orwell, George. (1972) *The Road to Wigan Pier*. Mariner Books. pp. 20-1, with adaptations.

Translate this excerpt into Portuguese.

**[value: 20,00 points]**

**RASCUNHO**

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		

**Read the following text carefully.**

A literatura brasileira construiu uma concepção do Brasil, projetando a visão que temos de nós, a maneira como nos compreendemos e nos representamos. É uma concepção plural, e nisso reside sua força e vigor – que é literário, cultural e político. A pluralidade é resultado do empenho por meio do qual projetos minoritários de Brasil foram expressos e preservados. A questão é: qual o sentido desses projetos ainda hoje? Projetos alternativos coexistem, na maioria das vezes, em condição de inferioridade, com o projeto de Brasil elaborado e levado a cabo pelas elites. Considera-se, também, que os projetos das elites ganham significado maior quando percebemos neles contradições, ou seja, quando neles percebemos as vozes das classes oprimidas. Enquanto houver contradição, convém dizer, o empenho continua, a História também.

Os antecessores de Machado de Assis tentavam ver o Brasil com os olhos europeus, indicando os caminhos para que o País pudesse acertar o passo com o progresso da civilização. Machado inverte o olhar: a Europa civilizada passa a ser vista pela ótica brasileira. Quando Machado publica suas obras fundamentais, a formação do sistema literário brasileiro se completa. Entenda-se por isso: produz as primeiras grandes obras de valor estético universal. Sendo um escritor identificado com os valores cosmopolitas, que desqualificou a busca da cor local como caminho para a excelência literária, sua obra, entretanto, está ancorada no ponto de vista local. Só que, agora, local já não é sinônimo de pitoresco, é aquele sentimento íntimo do tempo e da História.

BASTOS, Hermenegildo. *In: Cerrados*. Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Literatura, n. 21, ano 15, 2006, p. 91-112, com adaptações.

Translate this excerpt into English.

**[value: 15,00 points]**

**RASCUNHO**

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		



**Read the following text carefully.**

After the close of the 2003 World Trade Organization (WTO) ministerial meeting in Cancun, Mexico, United States Trade Representative Robert Zoellick unleashed a stinging attack on Brazil and its Latin American partners in the G-20 trade negotiating coalition. Lamenting the failure to reach agreement on the US/EU proposal to conclude the Doha round, Zoellick (2003) criticized Brazil's "tactics of confrontation", refusal to compromise and insistence on a "massive list of required changes" to the chairperson's discussion text. The tension between the Brazilian-led G-20 negotiating coalition and the US offers a highly illustrative point to initiating a discussion on contemporary Latin American diplomacy.

**CHANGING TRADITIONAL VIEWS: LATIN AMERICA IS NOT A HOMOGENOUS ENTITY**

Perhaps the cleverest element of Zoellick's blast against Brazil was the emphasis on how the G-20 not only violated pan-Southern solidarity by rejecting a text from the Thai WTO Director General Supachai Panitchpakdi, but also invalidated the supposedly rooted idea of intra-Latin American unity. As Zoellick highlighted, the text blocked by the G-20 was drafted by the WTO's General Council chairperson Carlos Pérez del Castillo, Uruguay's ambassador to the organization. In his ire, Zoellick appeared to be assuming Latin America can be viewed as a homogeneous unit with consistent shared interests and attitudes. The region is instead comprised of countries possessing a wide range of geographic, demographic, economic and historical characteristics impacting their independent foreign policy positions. "Latin America" as a "unity" is itself an externally devised notion promoted by the French in the 1830s in an effort to create an implicit sense of alliance between the region and Romance-language European countries engaged in a struggle with their Anglo-Saxon and Slavic neighbors. The French idea of "Latin America" as a contiguous unit did stick in the Washington policy consciousness during the 1800s when gunboat diplomacy sustained US efforts to establish the Western Hemisphere as its exclusive zone of influence.

While there has been important variation in how Washington has attempted to manage the different countries, the general tone and approach has started from a remarkably similar place whether the US counterpart was Brazil, Bolivia, Costa Rica or Mexico. Even the regional organizations spanning the hemisphere, such as the Organization of American States, have been seen as opportunistic tools for Washington, not forums within which to engage in serious problem-solving or issue management. Per the tradition initiated with the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, Latin America has remained a question of bilateral management and control for Washington (HAKIM, 2006).

The combination of somewhat comparable histories of Iberian colonization, geographic continuity on a common continental land mass, similarities in language – Brazilian diplomats speak fluent Spanish –, as well as an absence of serious inter-state armed conflict helps to build a sense that the region is harmonious and relatively homogenous. Overlooked in this surface-level sketch is the persistence of rooted tensions and conflicts in the region. Brazil and Mexico have soft contending ambitions for regional leadership, with Argentina often staking its own claim as well. The Bolivian armed forces are led by an admiral as a sustained note of protest against what it claims as Chile's illegal seizure of its coastal provinces during the 1879–83 War of the Pacific. Peru, too, has border complaints against Chile from that nineteenth century war and only recently settled an additional border conflict with Ecuador in 1998, a dispute which dated from 1942 and saw a series of conflicts and casualties throughout the twentieth century.

If we expand the list of territorial disputes in the region to include trade disagreements, political contretemps, historical misunderstandings and other forms of regional rivalry, we end up with a fairly extensive catalogue of dissent and discord in Latin America. What matters for understanding Latin American diplomacy is that these very real disagreements have a tendency to become of second-order importance to regional diplomats when faced with the need to unify in the face of pressure from a US or Europe that either dismissively tries to aggregate the region into a single, easy to manage unit, or pursues a strategy of divide and conquer to maintain implicit and explicit dominance. This pressure has had a major influence on how Latin American countries approach diplomacy and how they self-consciously exploit the externally created identity of Latin America.

**NOT QUITE UNITY, NOT QUITE COALITION**

Thanks to an accommodative and legalistic predilection for talking through disagreements, Latin America has become notable for the absence of inter-state conflicts. Although there are unsolved disputes in the region, resolution is consistently sought through negotiation and arbitration, not armed invasion. Even when conflict has erupted, the tensions appear reluctant and are quickly brought to the negotiating table by other regional countries.

Perhaps the best theorizing of the lack of inter-state armed hostility within Latin America can be found in the *concertación* approach to diplomatic management advanced by Argentine scholar Federico Merke (2015). The term *concertación* has no simple translation into English, being a reflection of an Ibero-American tradition of managing difference and dissent in politics such that it can become a strength rather than source of discord. At the heart lies an informally institutionalized process of summitry and discussion in lieu of power politics. Escalation in Latin American terms means the convocation of presidential diplomacy to discuss the matter of dissent, not the deployment of military forces to border regions. More significantly, it is often not just the presidents of the directly affected countries that meet, but rather the region's leadership or a delegated sub-grouping of ministers or national presidents.

Although there are a series of semi-regular presidential summits through groupings such as UNASUR, MERCOSUR, CELAC and so on, the *concertación* process is not rooted in a formalized framework, but rather exists as a convention embedded in the region's shared legalistic approach to international affairs. Chief amongst the legal norms driving *concertación* are the interlinked principles of sovereignty and nonaggression. Although precise interpretations are debated, there is cross-national agreement in Latin America that respect of international law is essential for mutual security and that great emphasis should be placed upon setting and observing the rules. The depth of *concertación* strategies of avoiding military conflict have been highlighted over the last fifteen years as substantial increases in military expenditure by many regional countries have resulted in increases in mutual confidence, not a rise of distrust-fueled arms races (VILLA; WEIFFEN, 2014).

Burges, Sean; Chagas Bastos, Fabrício. Latin American Diplomacy. In: Constantinou, Costas; Kerr, Pauline; Sharp, Paul (Orgs.). (2016) *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., with adaptations.

---

Write a summary of the text in your own words using up to 50 lines.

**Text length: up to 50 lines**  
**[value: 15,00 points]**

---

**RASCUNHO**

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		

31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		