UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE Fakulta sociálních věd Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

(Posudek vedoucího)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): **Phuong Thuy Do** Název práce: **The OSS in Vietnam during the Second World War**

Vedoucí práce (u externích vedoucích uveď te též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): PhDr. Jan Bečka, Ph.D., ministerský rada, Oddělení strategického rozvoje schopností, Odbor strategického rozvoje, Sekce obranné politiky a strategie, Ministerstvo obrany ČR

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

The thesis focuses on the involvement of the United States in Vietnam during the Second World War, especially on the role played by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the predecessor of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). This is indeed a very interesting and complex topic. The Second World War shattered the colonial system and the spheres of power and influence of the European powers, which have existed in Southeast Asia since the 19th century. The failure of the French (and, to some degree, British) governments to maintain control over their colonial possessions when faced with the rapid advance of the Japanese forces in the region (and in Asia-Pacific in general) created both the opportunity and the need for the United States to become more engaged. Given the situation in Vietnam, this inevitably brought the United States (especially the OSS) in contact with the Vietnamese nationalist/liberation organizations/movements, of which the most important was to become the Việt Minh led by Hồ Chí Minh.

The author of the thesis, on the backdrop of the events that have transpired during the Second World War and with subsequent developments in Southeast Asia in mind, seeks to answer the question of how and why has the relationship between the United States and the Vietnamese nationalist organizations and movements shifted from cooperation during the Second World War to alienation and later antagonism starting in the late 1940s and continuing until the 1970s. She also addresses the question whether the US involvement in Indochina after 1945 (and thus the Vietnam War) could be avoided had the US administration(s) taken into account the lessons learned during the Second World War and the assessment of the situation on the ground done by the OSS operatives.

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

The topic, as I have mentioned above, is complex. The author has done a thorough research of the available sources, both primary and secondary, and has made use of these sources when writting the thesis. I would also emphasize that the author has interviewed experts in the United States that lead specialized courses on the Vietnam War and, what is important in this particular case, on its roots and causes (including the US involvement in Southeast Asia during the Second World War). I find the number of primary and secondary sources used adequate for any master's thesis that would be dealing with any similar subject.

The thesis is well structured. The definition of the subject and the research questions as presented in the thesis is supported by relevant arguments. What I somewhat miss in the introduction is a more detailed explanation of the use of a clearly defined theoretical/methodological framework, which should have been applied both during the research phase and the thesis-writing phase.

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

The author has a very good command of English and thus the thesis is well-written with virtually no grammatical errors or stylistic flaws. Sometimes words or phrases are used which are, at least from my point of view, slightly biased, but not to an extent that would have a major impact on the quality of the paper presented. The quotations and references are more than adequate for a master's thesis and they have been done in a consistent fashion throughout the entire text. The thesis is structured properly along the prescribed outline.

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

The thesis clearly fulfils all the requirements necessary for its successful defence. The author has made use of a number of primary and secondary sources in her research and has integrated them well into the thesis. The questions that the author has presented in the introduction have largely been answered. Overall, I believe that the thesis is based on solid research of both primary and secondary sources and logically structured. It could have had a more clearly defined theoretical/methodological foundation which would then be applied systematically throughout the entire thesis.

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

1. One of the arguments that the author uses is that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a staunch opponent of colonialism and that his beliefs had created a hope in the region that the US would support the liberation/anti-colonial movements in Southeast Asia. Does the author believe that if Roosevelt had not died, he would maintain the same policy even during the onset of the Cold War? In other words, is President Truman responsible for the shift in the US policy towards Southeast Asia or would this change have occurred anyway given the global geopolitical developments?

2) How would, according to the opinion of the author, an international trusteeship of the (former) colonies in Southeast Asia actually work? Given the situation after 1945, would such a framework for governance of the colonies be actually feasible?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA (A-F):

I recommend the thesis for defence with the mark A-B (depending on the performance during the defence of the thesis before the examination board).

Datum: 11 JUN 20