



EDITAL Nº 1, DE 28 DE JUNHO DE 2023
CONCURSO DE ADMISSÃO À CARREIRA DE DIPLOMATA

**Segunda
Fase
(Dia 2)**

**Terceiro-Secretário
da Carreira de Diplomata**

**Data da prova:
Domingo, 17/9/2023**

PROVA DE LÍNGUA INGLESA
INSTRUÇÕES

- Você recebeu 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 e 1 (um) texto em língua inglesa – para elaboração de resumo em inglês.
- Verifique se a paginação do caderno de provas discursivas está correta.
- Verifique se os seus dados estão corretos nas folhas de texto definitivo das provas discursivas. Caso haja algum dado incorreto, comunique ao fiscal.
- 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 lápis em nenhuma etapa das provas.
- 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.
- O espaço para rascunho, contido no caderno de provas, é de preenchimento facultativo e não valerá para avaliação das provas discursivas.

Tipo “U”

COMPOSITION

Read the quotations below carefully.

Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations, fostering dialogue, and resolving conflicts between nations through peaceful means. It serves as the primary mechanism for promoting understanding, cooperation and the peaceful settlement of disputes in the international system.

Marie Julie in *Global Diplomacy – Investigating International Relations*.

We have no more reason to believe that the days of Gunboat Diplomacy are over than to believe that the threat of force will not be used on land and in the air.

T. B. Millar in James Cable *Gunboat Diplomacy – Political Applications of Limited Naval Force*.

Taking the quotations above into consideration, write a short essay explaining how these antagonistic views can be reconciled in the daily practice of Diplomacy. Provide a historical framework for your analysis.

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

PROVA APLICADA

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	

Área Livre

The political study of international institutions reveals a vibrant and diverse body of scholarship. In recent decades, research has turned from the study of formal international organizations to the study of regimes and institutions, informal as well as formal. For the most part, this turn has been salutary, as it has reflected a broad interest not only in formal organizations but in the deeper role that rules and norms play in a system of formally co-equal states. Initially, this turn was instigated by the observation that much of what is interesting about world politics —especially during the Cold War period— seemed to take place among intensely interdependent actors, but beyond the purview of formal interstate organizations. This turn was furthered by a rational-functionalist approach to the study of institutions, which took up the puzzle of how we could understand international cooperation at all, given the assumptions of neorealism prevalent in the US international relations literature at the time. Meanwhile, in European circles, theorists of international society worked from sociological assumptions on a parallel question: how can order be maintained in an anarchical international society?

These orientations have made for interesting theoretical fireworks, as we have seen in the broader debates between today's constructivists and rationalists. This debate is clearly reflected in the institutional literature as a distinction between those who view international institutions (including institutional form) as rational responses to the strategic situations in which actors find themselves, versus those who insist on a subjective interpretation of social arrangements (which may or may not be "rational" and are unlikely to be understood through the use of positive methodologies).

MARTIN, Lisa L.; SIMMONS, Beth A. International Organizations and Institutions. In: CARLSNAES, Walter; RISSE, Thomas; SIMMONS, Beth A. (ed.). *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage, 2013. p. 343-344. [adapted]

Translate this excerpt into Portuguese.

[value: 15,00 points]

PROVA APLICADA

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		

Área Livre

PROVA APLICADA

Recentemente, prevalece a tendência em se ver o relacionamento entre o cidadão e o Estado, o cidadão e o sistema político, o cidadão e a própria atividade política sob uma ótica maniqueísta, segundo a qual o Estado apresenta-se como o vilão e a sociedade, vítima indefesa.

Sabe-se que as dicotomias, via de regra, não se prestam a elucidações dos fenômenos de índole social. Teoricamente, elas separam o que são lados da mesma moeda, partes do mesmo todo. O maniqueísmo inviabiliza mesmo qualquer noção de cidadania, pois ou se aceita o Estado como mal necessário, à maneira agostiniana, ou se o nega totalmente, à moda anarquista.

Na prática, ele acaba por revelar uma atitude paternalista ao considerar o povo vítima impotente diante das maquinações do poder do Estado, ou de grupos dominantes. Acaba por bestializar o povo. Parece-nos ao contrário que, exceto em casos muito excepcionais e passageiros de sistemas respaldados inteiramente pela repressão, é mais fecundo conceber as relações entre o cidadão e o Estado como uma via de mão dupla, embora não necessariamente equilibrada. Todo sistema de dominação, para que sobreviva, terá de desenvolver uma base qualquer de legitimidade, ainda que seja a apatia dos cidadãos.

O momento de transição do Império para a República é particularmente propício ao estudo dessa questão. Tratava-se da primeira grande mudança do regime político após a independência. Mais ainda, tratava-se da implantação de um sistema de governo que propunha, exatamente, trazer o povo para o prosclênio da atividade política.

CARVALHO, José Murilo de. *Os Bestializados: o Rio de Janeiro e a República que não foi*. Companhia das Letras, 4. ed. 2019, com adaptações.

Translate this excerpt into English.

[value: 20 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		

Área Livre

PROVA APLICADA

Read the following text carefully.

Whilst there is a rich and growing literature on diplomacy, theories of diplomacy are less abundant. In view of its pivotal role in International Relations, diplomacy until recently received surprisingly little attention amongst theoretically oriented International Relations scholars. Indeed, a description of diplomacy is that it is “particularly resistant to theory”, and the well-known Israeli diplomat and foreign minister, Abba Eban, argued in 1983 that the “intrinsic antagonism” between theory and practice was more acute in diplomacy than in most other fields. This proposition may be less tenable today, as recent decades have seen a growing interest in, and several efforts to theorise, diplomacy. What is lacking, however, is “any metatheory of diplomacy – a theory of the theories of diplomacy – which might present all the different things that people want to identify and discuss in a single set of coherent relations with one another”.

Why, then, has diplomacy not been the object of more meta-theorising? There may be several reasons for the relative dearth of diplomatic theory. Two major factors relate to the conceptualisation of diplomacy and the character of the authors writing about diplomacy. A consensual conceptualisation of diplomacy that can serve as a foundation for theorising does not exist. Diplomacy “emerged as a contested concept”, and it “has repeatedly been contested over the last two centuries”. The use of the words “diplomacy” and “diplomatic” have several different meanings. In fact, the words have been characterised as “monstrously imprecise”, simultaneously signifying “content, character, method, manner and art”. According to Peter Marshall, a retired British diplomat, at least six related meanings may be distinguished.

First, “diplomacy” sometimes refers to the content of foreign affairs as a whole. Diplomacy then becomes synonymous with foreign policy. This means that theories of foreign policy are applicable. Second, “diplomacy” may connote the conduct of foreign policy. The word then becomes a synonym of statecraft. Henry Kissinger’s book, *Diplomacy*, which draws on his experiences as United States secretary of state, is a case in point. A third connotation of diplomacy focuses on the management of international affairs by negotiation; thus, the Oxford English Dictionary defines diplomacy as “the conduct of international relations by negotiation”. A similar definition is “negotiations between political entities which acknowledge each other’s independence”. Theories of negotiation, which are well developed, are then necessary to understand diplomacy. Fourth, understanding diplomacy resides in the use of diplomats, organised in a diplomatic service. This usage is more time-bound, as the organisation and professionalisation of diplomacy is rather recent. Fifth, diplomacy, and especially the adjective “diplomatic”, often refers to the manner of conducting relations. To be diplomatic means to use “intelligence and tact”, to quote Ernest Satow’s classic formulation. A sixth, related conceptualisation is to understand diplomacy more specifically as the art or skills of professional diplomats.

One definitional controversy concerns the non-violent character of diplomacy. Some experts conceptualise diplomacy in terms of “the peaceful conduct of relations” or “the establishment and development of peaceful contacts”, regarding diplomacy as the opposite to war or any use of force. Conversely, others are reluctant to draw such a clear-cut line, arguing either that the opposition of war and diplomacy is a Western notion; or that the blurring of the line between diplomacy and violence is one of the characteristics of modern diplomacy. During the Cold War, the coining of the phrase “coercive diplomacy” denoted the use of threats or limited force in diplomatic persuasion. In short, the lack of an agreed definition has been an obstacle to rigid theorising. As developed below, different conceptualisations of diplomacy entail different theoretical approaches.

A second major factor impeding the development of theory concerns the authorship of most works on diplomacy. Until recently, either practitioners or diplomatic historians wrote the bulk of the vast literature on diplomacy. Neither category of authors was particularly interested in theory building. Practitioners tended to be anecdotal rather than systematic, and diplomatic historians idiographic rather than nomothetic. Just as historians are interested in a particular past, practitioners draw on their own particular experiences. Neither practitioners nor diplomatic historians have been prone to generalise from different historical experiences and insights.

Diplomats have been prolific writers. Many have had scholarly ambitions and credentials and have reflected on their own practice to an extent that few other professions can match. Much of this literature is in the form of memoirs. In these works, there is a clear prescriptive bent. What characterises the good diplomat? How best to conduct diplomacy? These are questions occupying authors from antiquity to today. In addition to this prescriptive tendency, modern day ambassadorial memoirs tend to emphasise and exaggerate the profound changes that their authors claim to have experienced in their time of service whilst overlooking elements of continuity.

Diplomatic historians, for their part, have amassed a wealth of information about specific eras or incidents from antiquity onwards but have failed to forge any strong links with International Relations theorists. Although diplomatic history and International Relations have been characterised as “brothers under the skin”, academic parochialism as well as stereotypical and caricatured readings of one another’s sub-field have hampered interdisciplinary cross-fertilisation.

These and other aggravating factors notwithstanding, a number of theoretical approaches to diplomacy exist and continue to be developed. The most important of these, beginning with the long tradition of prescriptive tracts, offer observations and advice concerning the conduct of diplomacy. Realism, the predominant school of thought in International Relations scholarship after the Second World War, encompasses a conceptualisation of diplomacy tied to state power in an anarchic world. The so-

called English School offers a rivalling approach and different understanding of diplomacy, anchored in an international society with rules and institutions guiding state behaviour. Beside these two chief alternative approaches, there are more recent attempts at theorising diplomacy, drawing on post-positivist approaches, diplomatic understandings of international relations, suggestive metaphors, social anthropology, and gender studies.

JÖNSSON, Christer. Theorising Diplomacy. In: B.J.C. McKercher (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Diplomacy and Statecraft*. 2. ed. London/New York: Routledge, 2022 [2012]. p. 13-14. [adapted]

Write a summary of the text in your words.

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

PROVA APLICADA

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	

PROVA APLICADA

ATENÇÃO

Aguarde a autorização do fiscal para iniciar a prova.

