

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Lenka Stoláriková**

Název práce: **Juhokorejský jadrový program a americká podpora autoritativneho režimu**

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce):

doc. PhDr. Francis D. Raška, PhD.

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

The dissertation is mostly an analysis of the South Korean authoritarian regime at the end of the 1970s. The main aim is to evaluate whether it was possible for the U.S. to reduce its economic and military assistance at the end of Park's rule and to promote the democratization of the country. It tries to explore the factors, which influenced the U.S. decision. Subsequently, it verifies Owen and Poznansky's theory on the two conditions needed for the U.S. to be willing to stop supporting the pro-American authoritarian regime and to allow democratic elections to take place.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):

The topic is an impressive one and the student tackles the questions she poses quite well. Both the structure and the argumentation are fine.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):

I have found no serious problems insofar as presentation is concerned. The bibliography is more than sufficient and the citation of sources is fine.

4. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z bakalářské práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):

Lenka Stoláriková has opted to write her B.A. dissertation on the South Korean nuclear program and American support for the authoritarian South Korean regime in the late 1970s. The work is well structured and consists of an Introduction, three main chapters, and a Conclusion. There is a good bibliography and the sources appear to be balanced. In the next paragraphs, I will assess each part of Lenka's treatise.

In the Introduction, Lenka clearly states her main aim, which is to analyze whether and to what extent the United States could have limited financial and military assistance to South Korea at the end of the 1970s and applied pressure resulting in the overthrow of the South Korean régime. Her approach is analytical and the goal of each chapter is stated clearly. Lenka also discusses the most significant published works on the subject, especially the significance of the theory of Owen and Poznansky. The Introduction is well written and it encourages the reader to continue reading. I find no fault with this section.

Chapter 1 examines the international situation in the 1970s and United States-South Korean relations. Obviously, a key figure here is the then authoritarian South Korean leader Park Chung Hee. During Park's tenure, South Korea changed from being a pure military dictatorship to a "Korean democracy" under martial law with the Yushin constitution, which was an attempt to legitimize Park's rule. After Gerald Ford's ascendancy to the U.S. presidency in 1974, human rights in South Korea became an issue in the U.S. Congress. The relationship between the United States and South Korea was asymmetric with the South Koreans being dependent on the United States to sustain their regime. The nature of the relationship made Park Chung Hee uneasy and largely contributed to the South Korean quest for an independent nuclear deterrent. The Ford Administration saw the nuclear plans of South Korea as a threat to international stability and American influence and sought to address the matter through diplomatic means. Following Park Chung Hee's assassination in 1979, the Americans could have applied pressure for a democratic transformation, but instead chose to stick with the new authoritarian President Chun Doo Hwan. Lenka mentions how in the 1980s, the United States sought to end friendly authoritarian dictatorships in favor of democratically elected governments. She poses the question to what extent could the South Korean nuclear program have influenced United States policy decision not to end military and financial support for the South Korean regime. This chapter is both informative and succinct and I

believe that it logically flows into Chapter 2.

Lenka discusses the Owen-Poznansky Theory in Chapter 2. This theory was articulated in the article “When does America drop dictators?” Here Lenka discusses the key role of the White House in decisions concerning American support of authoritarian regimes. This support is naturally influenced by the views expressed in Congress, as well as influential political and military officials. According to Owen and Poznansky, two conditions need to be present for the U.S. to cease supporting an otherwise friendly authoritarian regime. The first condition is the existence of a domestic crisis that poses a threat to the regime’s existence. The second condition is the existence of support for the American free market model and democracy with no existing alternatives that could damage U.S. interests. In the event that these two conditions are met, the United States may agree to work with new political elites. In the first section of Chapter 2, Lenka cites the case of the Philippines where the Americans ultimately shifted support from dictator Ferdinand Marcos to the “people power revolution” led by Corazon Aquino. Likewise, Lenka demonstrates that, unlike in the 1970s and early 1980s, the opposition that emerged during the domestic South Korean crisis of 1986-1987 (when Chun Doo Hwan refused to implement promised constitutional reforms) did not involve a threat to American interests and, therefore, the Americans decided to shift support in favor of opposition demands. This chapter serves as evidence of Lenka’s excellent powers of analysis.

In Chapter 3, Lenka ponders whether the role of South Korea’s nuclear program played a role in President Carter’s decision not to withdraw American troops as he had promised earlier and instead continue collaboration with the authoritarian regime. She cites revised intelligence estimates in 1979 that the North Korean armed forces were stronger than previously believed and doubts were raised as to South Korea’s ability to fend off a potential North Korean invasion without U.S. military assistance. Also, the opposition in the 1970s was largely anti-American in favor of negotiating Korean reunification, which was not in the Cold War interests of the United States. Previous discussions as well as analysis of Park Chung Hee’s motivations (which the Americans thought could pose a threat to the entire region) have led Lenka to conclude that the United States did not trust the South Korean regime’s motives and, therefore, decided to stay the course and continue to support the South Koreans in order to provide a disincentive to South Korea from developing a nuclear capability of its own. This chapter is both informative and contains sound argumentation.

In the Conclusion, Lenka recapitulates her main points and states that the Owen-Poznansky Theory itself is insufficient to explain the continued United States support for the South Korean regime in the late 1970s. She cites two further factors, namely the great strength of North Korea’s military and the South Korean nuclear program.

This work meets the standards for a B.A. I must say, however, that a bit more proofreading would have resulted in Lenka correcting her incorrect spelling of Park. She writes “Pak”. I recommend a classification of EXCELLENT (B) contingent on Lenka’s performance in the oral defense.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):

Do you think that the Owen-Poznansky Theory could perhaps be a bit too simplistic? Why or why not?

What has the political evolution of South Korea been like since the American decision to support opposition demands for greater democracy in the aftermath of the 1986-1987 crisis?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA
(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhověl): **B**

Datum: **2.6.2019**

Podpis:

Pozn.: Hodnocení píše k jednotlivým bodům, pokud nepíšete v textovém editoru, použijte při nedostatku místa zadní stranu nebo příložený list. V hodnocení práce se pokuste oddělit ty její nedostatky, které jsou, podle vašeho mínění, obhajobou neodstranitelné (např. chybí kritické zhodnocení pramenů a literatury), od těch věcí, které student může dobrou obhajobou napravit; poměr těchto dvou položek berte prosím v úvahu při stanovení konečné známky.