

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Jakub Škopek**

Název práce: **Použití sekuritizace v kontextu íránské agendy-Barack Obama a Donald Trump**

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):

This dissertation aims to analyze the use of securitization in policy formulation towards Iran by the Obama and Trump administrations. Discursive analysis is utilized.

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

The topic is challenging. The student uses sound argumentation and the structure of the work is logical. Sources are well cited and a solid theoretical underpinning is present throughout the work.

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

There are some issues with capitalization, the clumsy misuse of the words chapter (kapitola) and subchapter (podkapitola), but, on the whole, the written presentation is good.

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

Jakub Škopek has produced a theoretically-based B.A. dissertation on the issue of whether and how securitization was used in the formulation of policy toward Iran by Obama and Trump administrations respectively. The treatise consists of an Introduction (Chapter 1), five main chapters (Chapters 2-6), and a Conclusion (Chapter 7). My beloved colleague and department chair, Jan Hornát, is just the man to supervise a work of this type. In the paragraphs that follow, I shall offer my comments on each part of the dissertation.

The Introduction (Chapter 1) spells out clearly the structure of the dissertation and gives the reader an idea as to what to expect. In addition, there is an in-depth review of the relevant literature. It is also worth noting that Škopek points out his use of discursive analysis. It goes without saying that the Introduction fulfills its purpose and encourages the reader to continue reading. I have no problem here.

In Chapter 2, Škopek presents the concept of securitization and discusses its application in the context of the United States. The role of grand strategy in American foreign policy is explained as is the constructivist conceptual underpinning of securitization. The securitization of Islam in American foreign policy is also discussed as is securitization of the issue of weapons of mass destruction. I think the chapter is well structured and convincingly presented.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the context of United States-Iran relations and the Iranian nuclear program. Škopek skillfully depicts the evolution of the relationship between the two countries and emphasizes how several decades of strategic partnership were interrupted by the Islamic Revolution of 1979. Sanctions, tension, and mistrust dominated the relationship since then. After 9/11, Iran was labeled as belonging to the axis of evil under the George W. Bush administration and President Bush even considered taking military action against Iran, but did not as his administration was preoccupied by ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Following the ascent of Ahmadinejad to the Iranian presidency, the Iranian nuclear program and desire to acquire weapons of mass destruction became the central issue in the American securitization discourse. Multilateral negotiations yielded no results. This chapter is well conceived.

In Chapter 4, the efforts of the Obama administration to deal with the issue of the Iranian nuclear program are discussed. Škopek provides details of the so-called Joint Plan of Action (JPOA) and the later, more advanced Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). The JPOA stipulated conditions, including

limitations placed on Iran's nuclear program and an easing of United States sanctions on Iran. The right of Iran to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes was also recognized by the United States. The JCPOA came later and was meant to form the basis for a permanent agreement. However, the JCPOA was opposed by Republicans and the pro-Israel lobby as well as some Middle Eastern countries that were wary of the prospect of greater Iranian influence in the region that would result from economic improvement of the country. This chapter gives the reader of the evolution of negotiations under the Obama administration and is well written.

The Obama administration and its stance on securitization forms the subject of Chapter 5. President Obama's approach was more constructive than that of the previous Bush administration. Obama continued to securitize Iran and its nuclear program, but his strategy was different. So-called "smart power" discouraged considering the use of hard power and involved a combination of diplomatic, security, and strategic instruments. As Škopek writes, Obama elevated the issue of the Iranian nuclear program to the status of a global priority and made clear that reaching an understanding with Iran was a priority for his administration. Emphasis was placed on multilateralism and diplomacy. The so-called "dual track policy" involved opening the door to dialogue while using sanctions to isolate Iran. Russia's role was important here. The greatest progress was made during Obama's second term when Rouhani succeeded Ahmadinejad as Iranian president. The JCPOA involved three securitization aspects, namely geopolitics, Islam, and security. Škopek explains each aspect well and contrasts Obama's approach with that of the previous administration. I think that this chapter is fine.

In Chapter 6, the stance of the Donald Trump administration vis-à-vis Iran and securitization is discussed. Trump's policy was based on three pillars. The first pillar involved annulment of the Iranian nuclear deal. The second was the re-imposition of sanctions that had been lifted as part of the JCPOA. The third pillar involved destabilizing the Iranian regime and achieving its possible replacement. Škopek goes into detail concerning the differences of opinion in the Trump administration. In the end, the United States left the JCPOA. Trump considered geopolitics as the main securitization aspect. However, in contrast to Obama, Trump portrayed the JCPOA as a great geopolitical threat that would financially strengthen Iran and not deter the Iranians from pursuing nuclear weapons. Unlike Obama, who felt that Islam could be utilized to de-securitize, Trump used Islam for securitization. Antipathy to Muslims resulted in immigration bans and so forth. Security was also viewed differently by Trump. Whereas Obama thought that the JCPOA bolstered American security, Trump perceived the JCPOA as a threat to American security. I like the way that Škopek compares and contrasts both the Obama and Trump approaches to securitizing the Iranian nuclear program.

The Conclusion (Chapter 7) recapitulates the main points expressed in the dissertation. He states that securitization played the major role in both Obama's and Trump's policies, but that each president perceived the three main aspects of securitization, that is, geopolitics, Islam, and security differently. Obama had a dual-track approach, whereas Trump's approach was based on pure realism.

This dissertation is of excellent quality. I recommend a classification of A based on the quality of the oral defense.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):
How is American policy towards Iran likely to change if Trump is reelected?

How would a Biden administration deal with Iran?

6. **DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA**
(A-F): **A based on the quality of the oral defense.**

Datum: **13.6.2020**

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.